

# The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 23, 1877.

## The Week.

IT is a pity that Judge West, before opening the Ohio campaign at Bellefontaine on the 16th, had not received a proof-sheet of Mr. Sherman's speech at Mansfield on the 17th. The addresses of the two representative Republicans might then have been made to harmonize somewhat more closely than they now seem to do. Mr. West does not perceive how it is possible for the authorities "to consummate resumption on the day fixed without the most serious consequences, unless the opposition House shall come to their aid, which is not at all probable." Mr. Sherman, on the other hand, shows plainly that he can "consummate resumption" on the day fixed without serious consequences, and that he will do so if the "opposition House" will only have the kindness to let him alone. Again, Mr. Sherman says nothing about the remonetization of silver, which Mr. West elaborately yet hazily discusses, believing in it apparently, and advocating it, although regarding it as "at best a hazardous experiment," and, in fact, managing to say as much against it as in its favor. We cannot forbear quoting from this discussion a paragraph which, as an example of stump rhetoric and an illustration of political hoodwinking, is almost unequalled:

"Together the gray and the golden eagle swept from their original perch of equal dignity and powers; the former has been stricken down in its flight. It is now proposed to reinstate it. Shall it be with its lost dignity and powers restored? or shall it in the outset be made a bird of prey to feed on and consume the public and private credit wealth of the nation, powerless to render a purchasing equivalent? If this, then indeed will it fall into contempt and again lag behind its more favored companion. To this, speaking for myself, I am unwilling to consent. Rather let them together soar, bearing up in their flight those rival handmaids to industrial and commercial prosperity—PUBLIC CREDIT AND PRIVATE FAITH."

About the only point on which Mr. West and Mr. Sherman were essentially agreed was that upon which we should have been glad to announce a disagreement—viz., the proposed treatment of the railroads and of the wages question by Congress. Even here, however, they are not wholly at one, Mr. Sherman believing in an irrepressible conflict between labor and capital, needing Congressional interference, while Mr. West maintains that an irreconcilable antagonism between labor and capital is most unnatural, and that the two can dwell together in eternal concord if the capitalist will adopt a reasonable minimum compensation to be paid at all events, and will add to it a compensation graduated according to the net profits of business. He adds that he would not have this harmony of labor and capital brought about by "compulsory legislation," and, although he eulogizes the proposed National Bureau of Industry, would confine its functions to those of a collector of statistics and an enlightener of public opinion. He concludes the discussion with a burst of eloquence which falls but little short of that upon the silver question above quoted.

Mr. Sherman's address, the main points of which we have elsewhere given, was on the whole of remarkable excellence, and will have a good effect upon the credit of the country. The only point of importance upon which his opinions were not clearly pronounced was that of the remonetization of silver, which we are inclined to infer he does not really believe in. It is true that throughout his discussion he refers constantly to gold and silver as though the two terms were convertible, and persistently uses "coin" where, if he means anything, he must certainly mean gold; but Mr. Sherman delivered his address in Ohio, and cannot be supposed as yet to have discarded all the arts of the politician. Further, in describing hypothetical modes of resumption, he says the necessary "accumulation both of silver and gold can be made by arresting from exportation our own

production of these metals," which is of course absurd. Mr. Sherman, by failing to characterize the remonetization project as it deserves, and as he probably knows it deserves, failed also to give the last proof of the courage of his opinions.

General Mahone, the defeated candidate for the Democratic nomination in Virginia, "fired the first gun" in the campaign in that State on his return to his home in Petersburg, his remarks being devoted to what is called in Virginia "readjustment," but in the places where the creditors of the State dwell, "repudiation." General Mahone declared that

"The interest of this people, the honor of Virginia, and the security of the creditor alike demand that a readjustment and equalization of the public obligations shall be made; and I am more than ever persuaded that unless speedy and earnest efforts be directed to this end, bankruptcy, dishonor, and open repudiation must ensue."

In other words, if the creditor doesn't stop reminding the debtor of the pledge of its honor for the payment of its debts, and does not reduce his claims to what the debtor feels like paying, the debtor will not pay a cent. This can hardly be improved, except by the Georgian method of silencing creditors who complain of not having had a hearing, by framing a constitutional provision preventing the State from giving them one. A good authority alleges that an additional State tax of one mill (the present tax being about five mills) would enable Virginia to pay her debts honestly and put an end to any supposed necessity for "readjustment."

The absurdity of keeping Collector Arthur at the head of the Custom-house in this city is once more shown by the third and last report of the Investigating Commission on the weighers and gaugers. The Commission finds that this branch of the Custom-house is rotten to the core; that appointments in it are simple matters of favor; that the number of office-holders is greatly in excess of the needs of the service; and that they receive extravagant salaries and have scarcely anything to do. The Commission recommends that the entire force be dismissed, the districts reorganized, and the whole method of doing business changed. We shall be anxious to see whether, after this report, the Administration will issue another order to the man who is responsible for all these abuses, directing him to reform them. The understanding now seems to be that Mr. Arthur is to be allowed to remain in office to the end of his term, to be then succeeded by a proper person. We sincerely trust, however, that this plan is not so completely fixed that no amount of exposure, however complete, will convince the President of the absurdity of giving him reform work to do. We can assure Mr. Hayes that in this city the reform of the customs service by Mr. Arthur is regarded as a huge joke. The dim prospect of his retirement is, we understand, already bringing to the front applicants for the place, most of whom are, as might be expected, totally unfit for it. The selection of a good collector of customs in a great commercial city like New York ought not to be a difficult matter; yet the abuses of the last twenty-five years, the gradual corruption of the whole civil service, the forced exclusion from political life of that class from which good collectors would naturally be drawn, makes the selection of one a task of some difficulty. What is wanted, we take this opportunity of saying, is not a custom-house lawyer, nor a politician who has developed great skill in "fixing primaries," nor a broken-down hack who, having no means of support, has set up as a reformer, but a merchant of good position, public spirit, an intelligent comprehension of the commercial position of the country, and possessed of a fortune which places him above temptation. The sooner we get him the better for Mr. Hayes and "the party."

Donahue, the rioter, who was brought up before Judge Donohue for contempt of court in resisting the order of Mr. Jewett, the

receiver of the Erie Railroad, has been sentenced to thirty days' imprisonment, and his term has already expired. This sentence has naturally aroused some dissatisfaction, for it has been treated as a test case of the willingness of the State to punish offenders of this class. The judge's decision implies that the action of the prosecution in making the proceedings turn on a contempt of court—a technical offence—when as a matter of fact neither Donahue nor any of the strikers knew that the property of the Erie Railroad was more sacred than that of any other road in the State, was a mistake. But it was certainly no less sacred, and Donahue's acts were just as riotous as they would have been on any other road. If thirty days is a sufficient imprisonment for a man who does his best to reduce the society of a great community to a state of anarchy, our penal scale should be revised. Donahue's crime is far more dangerous to the public generally, and more criminal, because it was without excuse, than many of the cases of larceny or burglary for which poor, starving, ignorant wretches are put at hard labor for months, or may be years. If it was necessary to let Donahue out on this charge after an imprisonment for thirty days, because it was merely a case of contempt, we trust he is going to be indicted at once for rioting.

Last Friday, the Senate at Albany, which was convened some weeks ago to try Ellis the bank-examiner, voted by 21 to 10, the majority being of both political parties, to remove him. A resolution was at the same time adopted exonerating him from any "intentional wrong." This termination of the trial is fortunate for depositors in banks as well as the public, for it shows that a total neglect of their interests and the statutory duties prescribed to the bank-examiner will be followed by some punishment. It must be confessed, however, that the punishment for so gross a case was light. It was found that Ellis, knowing one of the banks in his charge to be broken, concealed the fact and allowed depositors to go on depositing in it, as if nothing was wrong, to the extent of about a hundred thousand dollars. It was not denied that this was in direct contravention of his statutory duties, which required him to have the bank wound up. But his defence was substantially that he was no mere bank-examiner, but was charged with important financial interests, and must therefore survey the whole field and determine whether, all things considered, the public would stand having the bank wound up or not. This he said he did, when, recalling the disastrous effect of the failure of Jay Cooke and Duncanson, Sherman & Co. and the panic of 1873, he came to the conclusion that it would be dangerous to the general financial interests of the public, and would precipitate another crash if he performed his duties. This is a favorite view of official duty nowadays, and is frequently taken not only by bank-examiners, but by representatives, senators, governors, mayors, district-attorneys, and even judges on the bench. It leads to many calamities, from the simple ruin of private fortunes and the loss of private lives to great public disasters and scandals. Had the judges who have been trying Ellis been guided by it, instead of enquiring simply whether he had or had not failed to wind up a given bank, they would have allowed the determination of the case to depend upon such considerations as the probable effect of official scandals on the national reputation and the 4 per cent. loan, the danger to this or that "great party" of having any more such scandals, etc., etc. A copy of the record of Ellis's trial should be sent to every member of General Grant's late administration and to every official of the Freedmen's Savings-Bank. His line of defence has been in constant use by accused officials for years, and the result of this trial is one of the first signs that it has served its turn and is beginning to be understood.

Prices at the Stock Exchange were advanced 1 to 1½ per cent. during the week by the speculators who found themselves loaded with railroad stocks at the time of the railroad strikes. The public, or that part of it which owns railroad shares, took little interest in the movement except to sell stocks which they had held unremuneratively for a long time. The chief event of the week to speculators, and an important one to all concerned in cheap telegraphy, was the

consummation of an agreement between the Western Union and the Atlantic and Pacific telegraph companies, by which the two are to work in accord in the future, to "pool" gross earnings and divide them, the Western Union retaining seven-eighths and the Atlantic and Pacific getting one-eighth. The contract is for twenty years, and is secured by the transfer to Mr. Wm. H. Vanderbilt of a controlling interest in the Atlantic and Pacific, subject to the interests of the Western Union. This part of the arrangement was not made by the Atlantic and Pacific Company, but by two or three large owners of its stock. This practical consolidation, although technically only a traffic arrangement, may benefit stockholders, but at the expense of the public, who are interested in continuing such a competition as will keep rates low and the companies on their good behavior.

The particulars of this agreement may have some interest for our readers. Last winter a "pool," including an experienced California operator, was formed to buy up *all* the Western Union shares on the street—to corner the market, in fact, and "squeeze the shorts." Accordingly, in a few days the stock went up from 71 to 78, and the "shorts" began to cry aloud for mercy. Suddenly Western Union began to fall as rapidly as it had risen, and did not cease falling till it touched 56. The bulls suffered terribly by this decline, and they attributed all their misfortunes to a want of good faith on the part of the Californian and perhaps others of their number, who, they said, had joined the bears at the most critical period of their joint enterprise. The result was that certain ex-members of the pool, including the Californian, took a heavy interest in Atlantic and Pacific Telegraph, forming a close alliance with the bears, in the innocent belief that as they had rescued the bears from total destruction, the latter would be bound by the strongest ties of gratitude to keep faith with them. Things ran on for some months to the comfort of the allies, and Western Union sank as though there were no bottom to it, but Atlantic and Pacific meanwhile made no money and became a burden to its holders. Then a new mystery began to disclose itself on the Street. The great bear avowed his intention to put Western Union down to 40 and compel that company to buy the Atlantic and Pacific stock at prices dictated by himself. To sell Western Union under 60 would result in a handsome profit if the sellers could execute this intention. It is alleged that the Californian and others sold heavily, but the stock advanced in spite of them until it was discovered that the great bear had privately disposed of his interest in Atlantic and Pacific and had bought largely of Western Union, sending up the stock with great rapidity. What to do now was a burning question with those who had retained their Atlantic and Pacific shares; and since charges of bad faith would not put money in their treasury, they were driven to postpone revenge and get a portion of their money back by making a bargain with the elder company.

In the New York money market there were signs of higher rates for loans. The banks have little more than as much surplus reserve as a year ago, and their lending capacity is about \$45,000,000 less than then. The one favorable indication is that as legal-tender notes go from here first to the West and then to the South, to facilitate the transfer of the crops from the farmers and planters to the dealers, it is likely that gold will be imported from Europe, as sterling exchange at the close of the week justified importations. If there should accumulate here such an amount of gold as would be burdensome to the market, an opportunity would be offered to Secretary Sherman to sell bonds for gold for redemption purposes. At the close of the week the gold value of the U. S. legal-tender note for one dollar was \$0.9546. The bullion in a 412½-grain silver dollar had a gold value at the close of the week of \$0.9049.

Mr. Meredith Read, the United States Minister to Greece, has sent a despatch to the State Department asserting that Russia has heretofore been the only competitor of this country in the grain markets of Europe; that, under the most favorable circumstances, we can place grain on board vessels at 15 per cent. less cost than Rus-



sia; and that in the present embarrassed condition of that country, we could with a little effort control the grain trade of Europe. He also asserts that British merchants are now building vessels for the transport of grain from this country, and suggests that we should build the vessels as well as send the grain. To this last it may be replied that we shall certainly build vessels as soon as it will pay us to do so, and no sooner. Russia, it is true, is our chief competitor for the grain trade of England, but not the only one, nearly an equal amount having for the last three years been forwarded from Germany (including Austria-Hungary), France, and British India. Moreover, it will not be good policy for our merchants to suppose that Russian wheat will fail to reach England. The Baltic ports are, of course, closed, but the present price of wheat in London (about 33 per cent. above that of last year) justifies sending it from Russia by rail. We shall still have a good market for our abundant crops, since France has not much wheat to sell this year, and the good effect of this upon general trade is already most encouraging. It should not be forgotten, however, that, as England pays more than usual for wheat, she will have less money to spend upon other things.

No event or movement of any magnitude has taken place within the week on the theatre of war in western Bulgaria. The Grand Duke Nicholas and the commanders belonging to his army have left Plevna, Lovatz, and Selvi, which they confront, unmolested, and the troops commanded by Osman Pasha have made no serious move against either Tirnova or Gabrova, not to speak of an attack on the Grand Duke himself. The latter has now his headquarters at Gorni (Upper) Studeni (the use of "Gorni" alone is as wrong as that of the often-repeated "Boghaz pass," which is equivalent to "Pass pass"), a few miles east of the former headquarters at Bulgareni, and he has there been joined by his brother, the Emperor. Heavy reinforcements are evidently waited for before an attack in force is renewed on Osman Pasha, and in the meanwhile a strong cavalry movement is said to be preparing, or already in progress, in his rear, with the object of cutting his communications with Sophia, from which he mainly draws his supplies, and also of cutting off his retreat in case he is routed in the next great battle. The undertaking is thus declared to have a great aim, but is also acknowledged to be "hazardous." From the Pasha's camps no prospective events are announced by correspondents. That he has as yet made no attempt on Tirnova, which is not strongly covered, and from which the seat of the lately established Bulgarian government has been removed to Sistova, or on Gabrova, in order to force the evacuation of the Shipka pass, tends to show that he is apprehensive of an attack on his northern position at Plevna, or on the centre of his line at Lovatz, or else waiting for a combined action with Suleiman Pasha.

There are concurrent reports from various quarters to the effect that Suleiman Pasha, whose successes over Gen. Gourko are now acknowledged on all sides to have been very marked, has succeeded in crossing the Balkans, and in effecting a junction with Mehemet Ali's forces near Elena or Iliana, S.E. of Tirnova. These reports are, however, apparently contradicted by a reported bulletin of his dated August 19, in which he announces that he passed through Kazanlik and occupied the town of Shipka. Mehemet Ali himself has kept quiet in his positions on and near the White Lom, and he has been left undisturbed by the Russian Crown Prince, excepting one or two attacks on outposts repulsed with loss. The fortress of Rustchuk, however, has been repeatedly subjected to a heavy bombardment from Giurgevo, and has answered with an equally vigorous fire. A new bridge has been constructed by the Russians above Rustchuk, at Pirgos. More important movements seem to be in progress in the Dobrudja, which Gen. Zimmermann has not yet entirely evacuated. The Turks are reported to have landed near the Sulina mouth of the Danube a force of some 7,000 men, probably from Varna and belonging to the command of the Egyptian Prince Hassan, who are marching on Tulteha, while another Turkish force is advancing from Silistria on Tchernavoda, both divisions apparently co-operating to intercept the retreat of the Russian troops which recently re-

occupied Kustendje, where the Turks were expected to land. In order to extricate the remainder of his army in the Dobrudja, Zimmermann may have to retard the transfer of the bulk of it (north of the Danube) toward the positions in western Bulgaria. What other reinforcements the Russians there are receiving cannot even be conjectured, so vague are the accounts, but they expect a vast number of men, including most of the Imperial Guard.

Before Kars, along a line extending northward from Magaradjik, southeast of that fortress, the army of General Melikoff made an attack on Mukhtar Pasha's position early in the morning of August 18. According to the Pasha's report, the Russians, whom he states to have numbered 35,000 infantry, 10 regiments of cavalry, and 110 guns, were, after a combat of some ten hours, compelled to retreat to their camp with a loss of 1,500 killed, while that of the Turks was less than 500 in killed and wounded. The Russian version will undoubtedly differ materially. From the Caucasus the Russians report the successful advance of the Ingur (River) column through Abkhazia to the banks of the Kodor, at Atara, which shows that the Turks still hold Sukhum Kaleh, where Hobart Pasha has been embarking for Trebizond large numbers of fugitive mountaineers. The alternative attempt at a general rising in the Caucasus has proved a source of endless misery to the Abkhazians and other mountain tribes, but it has served the purpose of making a strong diversion in Transcaucasia, and thus contributed to the failure of the Russian campaign in Armenia. Those Circassians of Turkey, the Montenegrins, continue with their wonted stubbornness the assault on Niksitch, to the rescue of which Turks are again marching, and we hear again of the Duga pass, KIRSTATCH, etc. And there is also the unceasing talk of Serbia's continuing or going to break her neutrality, of Austria's threatening or not threatening to prevent the breaking of it, of the more or less warlike intentions of Greece, and of the more or less contented feelings of the Rumanians since the crossing of the Danube by their division under General Manu.

The famine in Southern India is prolonged by a second year of drought, and bids fair to be greater in extent and to demand more vigorous measures of relief than any occurring heretofore in the present century, though inferior to some of the great famines of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in the extent of territory affected. The last great famine—that of 1873-4—was confined to Bengal; the present one affects large portions of Madras and Bombay, covering with varying intensity a region of nearly 1,400,000 square miles, containing over 25,000,000 inhabitants. The people seriously afflicted probably number from ten to fourteen millions. The problem of relieving this starving multitude is, notwithstanding the experience gained during the Bengal famine in 1874, one of tremendous difficulty. The people of Southern India are very widely scattered over a great extent of territory, and it is absolutely impossible to reach many of them in time to prevent death from starvation. The country has almost no railroads, no navigable rivers, few roads of any kind, and these mostly very bad, and there are but few European officers who understand the language of the people to be relieved. Cattle would die of thirst long before a load of grain could be carried to some portions of the afflicted region. Government is doing what it can towards gathering the people in encampments at relief centres where they may be fed. At Madras, at last accounts, nearly one million were engaged upon public works, and more than another million were charitably relieved. Terrible epidemics are almost certain to break out at the relief centres before the famine is ended, and the number sure to die of starvation, in spite of all efforts to save them, is appalling. The ignorance and superstitious apathy of the people, and their caste prejudices, add greatly to the difficulties of relief, many of them preferring to die rather than to labor on public works or receive food from English hands. The expense of these recurring famines (this being the fourteenth of the present century) seriously threatens the financial solvency of British India.

## SECRETARY SHERMAN'S SPEECH.

MR. SHERMAN'S political speeches while a member of the Senate and chairman of its Finance Committee reflected with great steadiness the average opinion of the people of Ohio. Through the varying phases of the bond and greenback controversy he was never very far behind or very far in advance of the bulk of his immediate constituents. During all this time he betrayed more knowledge of financial topics and a clearer insight into economic science than he esteemed it wise to discover to the people. He has illustrated, with much intrepidity, the maxim that the truth should not be spoken at all times. This is not all that might be said of his public influence at certain critical periods, but it is enough to say now that the professional and business classes of the community had long since learned to be distrustful of Senator Sherman—a state of mind which might have grown out of the circumstance that Senator Sherman was distrustful of them, that he underestimated their intelligence, their influence, and the robustness of their moral health.

Elevation to higher responsibilities has been improving to Mr. Sherman. His speech at Mansfield, Ohio, on Friday last comes very near being a masterpiece of common sense. Near the close he falls into the same ditch-water in which Judge West soiled his garments, and here he reminds us of the Senator Sherman of nine or ten years ago. But it will be remembered that Senator Sherman never pressed the financial heresies he chose to espouse into the forms of law, and it may be assumed now that he will not be active in abolishing railway competition by act of Congress, although he had the exceeding ill grace to say that that would be a wise and useful thing to do. Aside from this there is very little in the speech to find fault with and very much to commend. The Southern policy of the President is defended not on the abrupt ground of necessity which Senator Morton espoused, but upon the broader one of right. It was not merely necessary, he says, that the troops should be withdrawn from the South, but it was right; it would have been unlawful to have kept them there; the negro is better off without them, the South is more law-abiding and more prosperous, and the North better satisfied. This is the most courageous word that has been uttered on the subject by any leading Republican since Packard and Chamberlain retired from business. The usual defence of the President's action has been couched in the deprecatory phrase, "Wait and give it a fair trial," or, "The President having done his sworn duty, do not condemn him without a hearing; perhaps the experiment of obeying the Constitution may not prove so disastrous after all." Mr. Sherman has rightly perceived that such a defence is untenable, and that the way to obtain popular approval is to challenge debate upon the merits. The reader will not fail to notice the shaft he sends at the admirers of General Grant. The Blaines and Camerons having been seized with new veneration of the policy of the ex-President toward the South, Mr. Sherman reminds them that it was his refusal to recognize Packard and his decision at one time to withdraw the troops and recognize Nicholls that deprived Packard of all moral support at home, honeycombed his legislature, and left President Hayes no alternative.

Civil-service reform, economy in public expenditures, and a colorless allusion to the tariff are the next topics of the speech. As to the first of these, Mr. Sherman avows his belief that the civil service needs considerable amendment, and says that the President's order forbidding officeholders to meddle with caucuses, conventions, and party machinery is not only just, but is in accord with the oft-expressed wishes of his own constituents and neighbors. He does not indicate with the clearness that could be desired what further steps should be taken to reform the civil service, but we must remember that the speaker is a novice at this work. He has never been an outspoken defender of the spoils system in politics, but he secured his promotion to the Senate by the usual promises of patronage in return for votes, and always made full use of his Senatorial prerogative in the filling of offices, so that we are quite satisfied to find him now in a reformatory mood. In the matter of public expenditures he makes a very creditable show-

ing. The cost of collecting the customs revenue has been reduced by three-quarters of a million, and the work on public buildings economized considerably more than a million dollars, without impairing the efficiency of the service or the value of the work. The argument which supports these economies would serve equally to condemn the Texas and Pacific subsidy, but upon that subject Mr. Sherman is silent.

The remainder of the speech, save the lapse into railway reform through Government control—Congress to fix maximum *and minimum* rates of transportation—relates wholly to the public debt and specie resumption. As to these topics Mr. Sherman's views may be presumed to be nearly decisive of the policy of the Administration. It gives us pleasure to say that these views are wholesome, and that the arguments by which they are supported are well calculated to sustain and improve the public credit and the public morals. There is a notable omission of the silver question from the points discussed, but we are not at liberty therefore to suppose that the Secretary has departed from the views given to the public a few weeks ago through the medium of the Associated Press, which were not at all agreeable to the advocates of the "dollar of the fathers." The incongruities of the Resumption Act of 1875 are noticed by the Secretary, and the opinion is expressed that this act contemplates the continued circulation of greenbacks after resumption—a policy which he personally favors. Notwithstanding these incongruities, he pledges himself that if the law remains unchanged "every dollar of United States notes will, before the time fixed for resumption, buy as much as an equal amount of gold or silver." Failing of other means to bring this about, he intimates that he shall use the surplus revenues and sell bonds of any of the classes authorized by law (4, 4½, or 5 per cents) for coin to redeem such greenbacks as may be presented at the Treasury at and after that time. Opinions may differ as to the amount of coin-reserve needed to effect and maintain specie resumption, but all difficulties on this score will disappear if the Secretary pursues his purpose unflinchingly. It was never contemplated that the greenbacks should all be redeemed in one mass—that would be a physical impossibility; but the duty to commence redemption on the 1st of January, 1879, is now binding on both Government and people, and if the coin then in the Treasury should be demanded, it would only be necessary to supply more from time to time with the means at the command of the Secretary. Mr. Sherman, however, does not anticipate this necessity—he looks to an extinguishment of the gold premium; but as he does not show how this is to be brought about under existing laws, there is a hiatus in his argument. Still, it is perfectly safe to rely on the power to sell bonds and use the surplus revenues as experience may prove needful. He rightly assumes that the credit of the Government and the resources of the country in precious metals and exportable produce are sufficient for all purposes. Let the Resumption Act be construed to mean "on and after the first of January, 1879," which is the only rational construction, and all difficulties regarding the supply of coin are removed. The value of the Secretary's speech consists in the declaration of his fixed purpose to resume at that time if not interfered with. For Congress to interfere with this purpose, so solemnly proclaimed to the world in its own acts—to interfere before the appointed time, and therefore before anybody can know whether the execution of the task will be difficult or not—would be a monstrous blunder and fraud. Whether it will be expedient to keep United States notes in circulation concurrently with bank-notes after specie resumption, is a question that may be safely left to the future.

Mr. Sherman's remarks on the commercial crisis and the relation of political parties thereto, though not novel, are well conceived and well timed. His statement that ours is the most prosperous of all countries at the present time is, however, an exaggeration. Official reports show that railway earnings have been steadily increasing in England during the past year, and pauperism steadily diminishing. These are safe indications of returning prosperity, and we have nothing of like import to show. Perhaps the bountiful harvests of the present year may lift the cloud that has so long hung over



American trade, but so many predictions of better times since 1873 have been falsified that the school of the prophets has fallen into disrepute. Let us hope that the Secretary's vision is clearer, and that he is correct in saying that the worst is over and that industry will soon revive.

#### THE TURCO-RUSSIAN CAMPAIGN.

THE Russian defeat at Plevna has made a serious change in the situation, which, though it may have no influence on the final result, will doubtless postpone the Turkish overthrow. That it is a misfortune for Turkey, we think there can be little question. It, in the first place, removes all prospects of interference in her behalf from any quarter. If the Russians had been able to fulfil the promise of the opening of the campaign, and advance without serious check on Constantinople, the Powers would undoubtedly have cried *Halt!* before she got there, and have imposed a peace which would have left Turkish resources practically unimpaired, however much it diminished the Sultan's independence. Now, however, it seems certain that the combatants will be left to fight it out, and that when the end comes Turkey will have no claim to consideration except her misfortunes. The Mussulman population will be utterly exhausted for all military purposes, and Russia will be, according to usage, entitled to compensation in proportion to her efforts and sacrifices. In fact, it is not impossible, and we think not improbable, that the battle of Plevna has sealed the doom of the Ottoman Power in Europe. The war now raging on the Danube has one striking point of resemblance to the late civil war in this country in the first campaign; namely, that a great many persons are greatly interested in having it kept within narrow limits, and in not allowing it to go too far. They want a war which will frighten the Turk, and make him behave himself, but not a war that will damage him greatly or expel him from Europe, or loosen his hold on the Christians too seriously. They would like, in short, a war "with limited liability." The chances are very strong that the late Russian reverses, like Bull Run and the Seven Days, are the very thing needed to upset all the calculations and precautions of all the prudent statesmen of the West, and convert the struggle into a desperate and successful attempt, not to readjust the Turk's relations to Christendom, but to destroy him as a European state, and compel the great Powers, once for all, to face the dreaded and often-postponed task of deciding what shall take his place.

The secondary cause of the Russian check it is now not difficult to point out. Of course, the first and fundamental one is the want of a great strategist. But the proximate reason of the Russian failure to strike the catastrophic blows which made the German campaign in France the wonder of the world, is plainly an overweening contempt for the enemy. This contempt would be justifiable enough in assailing the Turks in the open field, but there is nothing in their military history to justify any such contempt for them when fighting behind breastworks, as has been indicated in the Russian attacks on the fortified and naturally strong positions at Zevin and Plevna, with forces not greater than or even inferior to those of the defenders. Behind earthworks all the defects of the Turkish army disappear, or are not felt—the worthlessness of the officers, the absence of transport service, the inefficiency of the commissariat, and the absence of drill and organization. The raw Bashi-Bazuk, just arrived from Asia but behind a parapet, is, once he has got used to the breechloader, as good a soldier as any the Russians can bring against him, and, indeed, will bear pounding better. He will not resist the assault of a greatly superior force, but he may be relied on to keep out any force which is no greater than his own—a lesson which the Russians have certainly learnt in their Turkish wars a score of times.

Under these circumstances the attack on Plevna, with an army somewhat inferior to Osman Pasha's, must be looked on simply as a remarkable piece of folly, for which it is difficult to account. The fact that Osman did not attempt to follow up his victory makes it plain enough that the Turks know both the secret of their

strength and weakness, and that nothing will please them better than to have the Russians launch small parties against their positions and thus throw away the invader's greatest advantage—his immense preponderance in numerical strength. The Russians have evidently begun, as we did, with the "annconda policy," but will probably have to end, as we ended in our war, by getting together the largest force possible and using it to strike blows so "tremendous" as to leave nothing to chance and nothing to the enemy's valor or devotion. The old and much-talked-of rule of war, that "you must be strongest at the point of attack," has won most of the really great victories of history, but it is an inconvenient rule to follow, and all commanders naturally try to persuade themselves that once in a while strength may be taken to lie in something else than number—in morale, for instance, or discipline, or in the goodness of the cause. Sometimes they are right, and cover themselves with glory by dint of audacity; but for the most part, as the French saying is, "Providence is on the side of the big battalions," and compels even the most brilliant strategists to solve the seemingly humble and prosaic problem of having always three men to the enemy's one as the first and great condition of all success.

In the sore struggle on which the Russian Emperor and people have now entered, they may fairly claim the sympathy and good wishes of all civilized—we do not need to say of all Christian—men. They are doing the last and greatest work of deliverance now left for Christendom to do—a work in many of its features having as strong claims to respect and support as any emancipation of slaves which has yet taken place, because dealing with an evil which has probably inflicted more moral and material damage on manhood than any slavery which the modern world has witnessed, and a work, too, which all Europe should long ago have undertaken. That it has been left for this generation to do is the crying shame and scandal of modern history. And it is by no means necessary to show that Russia has entered on it, and is prosecuting it, in a spirit of pure philanthropy, any more than it is necessary to show that the North fought out the late war solely through love for the negro, in order to entitle her to our good wishes. Much the same class in England which, in 1862 and 1863, demanded philanthropic motives of absolute purity from the North as the price of their sympathy, are now horrified by the suspicion that Russia in attacking Turkey seeks more territory and more sea-room, besides the deliverance of her fellow-Christians. Nothing is more natural than that she should do so, and even if it were a matter of reproach, we should be unable to say who of all the Powers of the earth was entitled to cast the first stone at her. But after admitting it, and giving it all the weight that can possibly be claimed for it, the great fact would still remain that every improvement in the condition of mankind which has been wrought by war has been wrought under the influence of mixed motives. Great masses of men have never yet been put in motion for the battlefield in a spirit of pure missionary zeal, and there is something grotesque as well as revolting in the cant of those who, while rightfully glorying in the fact, for the Hindu's sake, that England now holds India, no matter by what means or with what aims she acquired it, cannot bear to have the Bulgarian or Armenian delivered from tyranny as bad as that of the Moguls or Mahrattas by anybody who cannot produce a certificate that his heart is pure, and that Christian love is the sole source of his sacrifices.

#### THE CHARGES AGAINST JUDGE DILLON.

IN the *Nation* of the 12th of last month we noticed some public charges involving the reputation of Judge Dillon, growing out of the foreclosure suit of the Central Railroad of Iowa. We did not vouch for their truth, but expressed the opinion that the scandal was so grave as to call for the examination of the charges by some competent tribunal, and stated that we understood that the persons aggrieved had taken legal advice, looking to the impeachment of the judge at the approaching session of the Senate. Since then Judge Dillon has replied to these charges at length in a published letter to the Hon. Thos. C. Reynolds of St. Louis, and we have been called upon by several newspapers which have undertaken the

defence of Judge Dillon to either prove these charges or retract them. To call upon a newspaper to prove the truth of charges of this kind is obviously to ask an impossibility. We have no power to send for persons or papers, to swear or to examine or cross-examine witnesses. All that can be fairly asked of us is to show that there is reasonable cause for a judicial examination of the case, and this we originally thought there was. A further consideration of the facts has convinced us that we were right, and that the case is even darker than we originally supposed.

The charges were that Judge Dillon had grossly denied and delayed justice in the foreclosure suit of the Central Railroad, and the facts on which they were based were stated to be as follows: 1st. Notwithstanding a final decree was entered by consent of all parties, authorizing a sale of the road in October, 1875, the execution of the decree was delayed nearly two years: 2d. Judge Dillon during this delay removed a competent receiver and put an unfit man in his place, who not only mismanaged but plundered the road. 3d. On charges being brought against this receiver he refused to examine them. 4th. Having first denied an appeal from the decree of 1875, he almost immediately afterwards allowed it, without any change of circumstances; and, having first decided that it was impossible to have the decree corrected or a new decree entered, he subsequently decided the opposite. 5th. Having finally granted a stay of proceedings, and the case having been taken to the Supreme Court at Washington, and there decided against him, and the stay set aside, he still continued for some time to prevent the execution of the decree. 6th. The Hon. Hiram Price, the father-in-law of the judge, having been made a commissioner early in the litigation to examine and report upon the road, comes forward, after all these delays have depreciated the value of the property, with an offer to buy the road at thirty-three cents on the dollar. We gave an abstract of Judge Dillon's published reply to these charges two weeks ago, but have deferred replying to it, partly because, as we stated at the time, only a competent tribunal could dispose of them finally, and partly because any reply involved an examination in detail of a voluminous record over 3,000 pages in length. We should, in fact, have much preferred to leave the matter where it was until some body like a committee of Congress could take it up, and either vindicate Judge Dillon as he should be vindicated, if innocent, or drive him from the bench which he disgraces, if guilty; but as the newspapers which have undertaken the defence of Judge Dillon have seen fit to infer from our silence that the original charges were baseless slanders, and that there is no ground for investigation or criticism, we feel it to be our duty to our readers and the public to correct this misapprehension. What we shall now say is based upon a careful examination of the record.

In the first place, it will be noticed that there is no dispute as to the fact of the final decree having been entered in 1875, or that it remained unexecuted for nearly two years. There is no question either that during these two years the vast majority of the bondholders have been trying to get it executed, and only a small faction, headed by Russell Sage of this city, representing \$200,000 in bonds, opposed it. What Judge Dillon says about "warring factions" of bondholders is a misrepresentation of the facts. Since the decree of October 22, 1875, all the bondholders except the Russell Sage party have been entirely united as to the proper course to be pursued. The question is, therefore, What caused the delay? If the decree had been allowed to stand there would have been no trouble. As to this, Judge Dillon declares the reason that the decree was not allowed to stand was that "the Court supposed at the time it was a decree by consent, but this soon afterwards turned out to be a mistake." Now, we say without hesitation that there is not the slightest scintilla of evidence in the whole record to show anything of the sort. The only persons who objected to the decree were the party headed by Russell Sage referred to above. This party, at some time between Oct. 1, 1875, and Oct. 22 (the latter being the date of the decree), by letter to the trustee under the mortgage, the Farmers' Loan and Trust Co., authorized it generally to foreclose on "such terms and conditions as a majority of the bondholders desire." The trustee thereupon "asked the advice of the Court in the premises," and stated that it "was ready to execute any decree the Court might see proper to make." This communication was presented to the Court, and the decree was thereupon entered. Further than this, in an opinion delivered at the May term, 1877, the judge states, speaking of the same decree, that "it was procured for the equal benefit of all," and adds generally that the Court "cannot entertain the application of specific bondholders except when they come in and represent and make a case, showing that the trustee is guilty of a breach of trust or neglect of duty." No such showing was ever made. Again, on the 16th of December, the Court denied an appeal prayed for

by the trustee; because, "1st, the decree in question was entered by consent of all the parties in interest." It is not until the 13th of January, 1876, that a pleading appears upon the record signed by one W. W. Cole, as counsel for the Sage party, containing an allegation that the decree was "not entered upon and with the consent of all the parties thereto." What parties had not consented was not stated, and was manifestly incapable of proof. The allegation was not verified by the affidavit of a single bondholder. Who W. W. Cole was we have no means of knowing, but he appears to have been injected into the case for the purpose of filing this extraordinary document, and to have then retired from it. Lawyers only will perhaps be able thoroughly to apprehend the singularity of the behavior of a court which under such circumstances reopens a final decree; but to laymen it must be obvious that under such rulings there could be no final decree by consent in any railroad foreclosure case in which there are a large number of bondholders. The record therefore shows plainly that the beginning of all the delay was caused by the Court itself.

We pass over for the present the charges connected with the receiverships, to consider the others immediately connected with the appeal proceedings. As to the point that, having denied an appeal, he turned round and granted it without any change of circumstances, it is admitted that Judge Dillon denied the first appeal; but he says that there was a change of circumstances, because

"The first appeal was applied for by the trustee on behalf of certain bondholders not parties to the record, leaving the rest of the decree unappealed from. This I decided could not be done. The next application was made, not by the trustee, but by bondholders who did not consent to the decree, to appeal so far as to protect their own interests; and the allowance of this appeal the Supreme Court of the United States has sustained (3 Otto, 412). What can be thought of the accuracy of the statement that there was no 'change of circumstances'? How unjust to charge me with improper conduct in allowing an appeal which the Supreme Court has sustained by refusing to dismiss it!"

This is a misstatement of the facts as we understand them. We have just shown that the decree having been by consent, and no proof having been introduced to upset this fact, there could be no change of circumstances. Whether bondholders came in, or the trustee came in for bondholders, made no difference as long as it was a matter of record, unshaken by proof, that the decree was by consent. But, besides this, the only change of circumstances which Judge Dillon refers to is contained in the fact that the first appeal was applied for by the trustee, while the second was applied for by bondholders, and sustained by the Supreme Court. Now, the peculiarity of this as a defence is that, as a matter of fact, the bondholders who applied in the second instance were the same bondholders (the Russell-Sage party) for whom the trustee had applied in the first, and the rights to be protected (had there been any) were the same in both cases, and Judge Dillon so treated the case, because, when allowing the appeal, he ordered it to be taken as of the date originally applied for by the trustee; while it appears from the decision of the case by the Supreme Court which he refers to that the appeal was sustained simply as a matter of practice, without regard to the merits, the Court directing substantially that the decree should still be executed as if there were no appeal pending.

Judge Dillon next proceeds to deal with the charge that, having first decided that it was impossible to have the decree corrected or a new decree entered, he subsequently decided the opposite. He says:

"This is a total misapprehension, and exactly the reverse is true, as will be seen in 3 Otto, p. 415, where I say, as 'the term at which this decree was rendered has not yet ended, but stands adjourned until January next, the proper course for the parties in whose behalf an appeal is sought (viz., the appeal sought by the trustee and refused) is for them to appear, and if the decree is erroneously entered, or is improper, to apply to be made parties, or to have the decree corrected or a new decree entered.' It is thus seen by the official report that precisely the reverse of the newspaper statement is the truth."

He here seems to make out his case, though we infer from the record that the charge was not correctly put. But it would require too much space to examine in detail the precise ground on which it rests, and we cheerfully give the judge the benefit of the doubt.

As to the granting of a stay of proceedings, or *supersedeas*, the adverse decision at Washington, and his subsequent preventing of the execution of the decree, he says, first, that he "never granted any stay of proceedings whatever." The following is the language of the record of the order granting it (with the appeal)—"or if said Sage, Buell, and Cowdrey desire said appeal to operate as a *supersedeas*, the bond for that purpose is fixed at the sum of \$1,000,000." It is somewhat staggering to find a judge who used this language saying he never granted any stay at all. The appel-



lants, thinking the bond was too large, got it reduced by Judge Miller, but the *supersedeas* disposed of by the Supreme Court is that of Judge Dillon.

The statement that after the decision against him in the Supreme Court he continued to prevent the execution, he denies emphatically, and says that the trustee has ever since that decision been at liberty to order a sale. Messrs. Turner, Lee & McClure, counsel for the Trust Company, wrote us a letter on this subject, making the same assertion two weeks ago. As to this matter we do not need to go outside the record, but the evidence of the record is fortified by extracts from a letter from these same counsel, which has already been quoted in the newspapers, and which we have seen. Writing on January 19 last, to the representative of the majority of the bondholders, one of these counsel, representing the trustee, says: "Pardon me if I say . . . that when you know that the course . . . which you criticize as the obstructive course of the trustee was pursued under special directions from Judge Dillon, you may consider," etc., etc. If we had known of the existence of this letter at the time Messrs. Turner, Lee & McClure wrote to us, we should have exposed the character of their communication. It is clear that either their letter to us saying that "the statement that he continued for some time to prevent any execution of the decree is absurd," was untrue, or else their letter just quoted above was false. But all question as to this is set aside by the record of the opinion of the Court delivered in March, 1877. The Supreme Court having set aside the *supersedeas*, there was no reason why the decree should not at once have been executed, and an application was made to the Court for that purpose; nevertheless Judge Dillon warned the Trust Company off, in language calculated to deter any prudent trustee from doing anything at all. It is a significant fact that while Judge Dillon, in his reply, declares that the trustee "appeared and opposed the application," the record shows, on the contrary, that it submitted itself to the direction of the Court. The opinion is too long to quote; but its *animus* may clearly be seen by a comparison of it with his opinion at the May term, on a renewal of the same application, when finally, after a delay of nearly two years, he suddenly changed his tone and, while denying the application, urged the trustee to execute the decree, saying, "We would be glad if the trustee could see its way clear to execute." Down to this time it is obvious that, through Judge Dillon's action, the trustee had been prevented from giving effect to the judgment of the Supreme Court setting aside the stay. It will probably strike most lawyers, too, as rather novel law that the execution of a final decree of a United States court is a matter of choice, with which the court has nothing to do.

Judge Dillon goes on to say that it is a "noticeable and most significant fact" that the "faction among the bondholders" who wanted the sale made pending the appeal refused to submit the matter to the Supreme Court on printed briefs under Rule 20, when it might have been decided in a few days, but insisted on oral arguments, thus tying up the appeal for two or three years. The explanation of this is that what Judge Dillon calls a "faction," and what is in reality all of the bondholders except the Sage party, knowing very well that there are no merits in the appeal (as will appear from what has gone before), do not care whether it is tied up for two years or not. The natural explanation of their conduct in not going to the Court on written briefs is that they wanted the benefit of an oral argument.

To sum up this whole matter of the appeal and *supersedeas* proceedings, the delay of two years was caused by the Court on the ground of objections made by bondholders, not originally parties of the record, representing a small amount of bonds, who had already consented to a final decree, and who brought forward no evidence that their rights were invaded by it.

In the May opinion of this year Judge Dillon states it as the opinion of the Supreme Court "that individual bondholders ought not to be allowed to become parties to the record in railway foreclosure cases, *unless upon strong and clear reasons, for good cause.*" This is, of course, good law, and we should have supposed that Judge Dillon would hardly have quoted it without bringing forward at the same time the strong, clear reasons and good cause which led him originally to admit the Sage party of bondholders to intervene.

But by far the gravest charges are connected with the appointment of the receiver, Mr. J. B. Grinnell, and the removal of Mr. Pickering. On this head the misstatements of the judge in his reply are numerous. He speaks of Mr. Pickering as "provisional receiver." The suggestion, of course, is that his receivership was intended to be temporary only. As a matter of fact the record shows that he was appointed permanent receiver

January 7, 1875. He next says that charges of a serious nature were made against him, and "pressed at every term." He omits to say, however, that the record shows that the charges were all withdrawn, and the persons making them "urged his (Mr. Pickering's) continuance" in office on September 30, 1875. Three months after the withdrawal of those charges (January 18, 1876) he was suddenly removed and Grinnell appointed. Of course we cannot undertake to prove that Mr. Grinnell was, as is alleged, a grossly and notoriously unfit man for the place, or that Mr. Pickering was a fit man; but complaints were made against him. Judge Dillon says that they were not supported by affidavit, but they were as a matter of fact supported by the affidavit of Mr. Ashhurst, whom he elsewhere describes as "an able and respectable attorney of Philadelphia," and he declined to investigate them. The removal of Mr. Pickering, against whom no charges were made, and who was satisfactory to the vast majority of the bondholders, and who was complimented by the Court at the time of his removal, may be compared, for the purpose of getting at the *animus* of the Court, with its action when this same majority undertook to remove the trustee under a provision for summary ouster contained in its articles of incorporation. The Court held, in plain nullification of the provision in question, as the record shows, that the action of the bondholders was void. Judge Dillon finally says: "As to the charges against Grinnell, I never heard anything more of them, and supposed they were dropped." There is independent evidence to contradict this. Writing on March 19, 1877, Mr. Grant, counsel for the Trust Company in Iowa, says, on the subject of Grinnell's management, that

"The business has no head, no order or system, and is in general confusion; that Mr. Grinnell has undertaken to manage a business of which he knows nothing, and is governed by persons who influence him for their own benefit. That he shall insist to the judges that they appoint or allow the bondholders to appoint a competent manager; that he suggested that the majority would want Pickering, but the suggestion did not take. That he had told Judge Dillon privately that he was afraid Grinnell's want of judgment would produce great mischief, but that he did not think it advisable, under any circumstances, to openly assault the Court's appointee, and should feel justified in resorting to every expedient to save the property from loss."

Writing again, March 21, 1877, he repeats that

"There is no head, no order, no system—a perfect array of officials who do nothing, and have others under them, and a constant mismanagement from Mr. Grinnell's want of knowledge of the business; that the line of fence is badly built, because Grinnell furnished worn-out ties for posts; that iron was purchased by a man who knew nothing about it, and is poor and worthless."

And again, March 27, he says that

"Three prominent cases of most gross mismanagement are established beyond doubt. Mr. Grinnell's attempted qualification of the facts is contradicted by his books and clerks."

Again, May 12, that

"He thinks it essential to safety to get Grinnell out of the management."

Again, that

"Grinnell is a politician, and all things to all men, and knows nothing of railroad management."

It is proper to add that Mr. Grant is the most intimate professional friend of Judge Dillon in Iowa. That Mr. Hiram Price offered to buy the road at thirty-three cents on the dollar Judge Dillon does not deny, but thinks there was "no harm in it." And he adds that the trustee was directed by the decree to buy in the property for the whole amount of the first-mortgage debt, which greatly exceeded the value of the property. This is true, but would not be apt to qualify the surprise of the bondholders at receiving (after delays caused by the Court had depreciated the value of the property) an offer at a price fixed by this depreciation. It seems a pity, if there was no harm in Mr. Hiram Price's offer, that he does not come out and tell on whose behalf it was made.

Here we are obliged to leave this curious case for the present. It is evident that there appears to be reasonable ground for a searching investigation by some competent tribunal. Steps are to be taken, we understand, to secure this.

#### A GENERAL VIEW OF THE EUROPEAN CRISIS.

PARIS, July 26, 1877.

EUROPE is suffering now from the effects of a long crisis which has many causes. I was lately in Germany, and nowhere is this crisis felt more keenly than in the country which of late years has gained the greatest successes in the political field. Capital is everywhere unemployed,

and cannot find any remunerative rates of interest. We are suffering in Europe from the excess of useless capital; more than two milliards of specie are in the vaults of the Bank of France. Production became overabundant after the war of 1870, and we are feeling now the effects of this over-production.

Is the present crisis only to be compared to those which have been noted before, or ought we to find in it something more? Can it not be traced to political as well as to economical reasons? Europe is now a great camp, and the compulsory system has converted the whole of our youth into an army. It may be said that in times of peace an army does not destroy any capital; but it hinders capital from being created, and it may safely be asserted that at the present moment the amount of capital which is lost every year amounts to two milliards of francs, if we admit that there are two million of men in the ranks in Europe, and that each of these men is capable of creating a capital of a thousand francs in one year. Add to this the military expenses which may, and certainly do, have a great political utility, but which are unproductive in an economical point of view, such as the expenses of constructing forts, barracks, etc. If we make the addition of these expenses for France alone, we shall find four hundred millions for last year and two hundred millions for this year taken out of that elastic fund called the *liquidation* fund. Germany must run with us in the race of millions, and it is clear that she is becoming tired of this new sort of rivalry. We can fatigue Germany by our armaments more than we could probably hurt her by our arms.

The tremendous sacrifice which the new conditions of war impose on the nations can be justified in some instances. The loss of to-day may become the gain of to-morrow. It was Mirabeau who said as far back as 1789, speaking of Prussia, that war had become with her the national industry. Her monarchs had applied themselves to the creation of a potent instrument of war, and we know how this instrument became the means of conquering Silesia in the last century, and in our time of placing all Germany under the hegemony of Prussia; it would be idle to say to the Pomeranians or the Brandenburgers that the maintenance of a large army is a great loss of capital. If some nations can look upon war as a remunerative industry, as did ancient Rome, it is not so with the majority of nations. France has no conquests to make; she is only regretting her ancient conquests, and her position has become purely defensive, notwithstanding all that may be said by interested parties about her projects and her anti-Italian or anti-German tendencies. Still, France has now an army which in war times may amount to almost two millions of men. The peace budget of the War Department is now as much as 500,000,000 francs, and we must add to this 126,000,000 spent upon the navy. Italy has accomplished her unity; what more can she desire?—the little valley of the Trentino, which enters her territory on the north like a wedge, but which can no longer be made the centre of any great military operation against her? She is said to look with envy from the Sicilian shores on Tunis and its territory. But are the Trentino and Tunis worth any great sacrifices? Italy spent, however, in 1876, for her army 189,000,000, and for her navy 37,000,000.

Austria has no conquests to make; thus far she turns a deaf ear to those who tempt her with the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and seems to say, "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes." Austria spent in 1876 277 millions for her army and navy. All the expenses of Italy and of Austria may be called unproductive; the expenses of France have at present, if I may say so, a purely negative character, since France has no immediate or near object to attain. The same cannot be said of the two nations of Europe which in one sense may be called the youngest, those which tend more naturally to break the barriers opposed to them by nature and to make new conquests—I mean Northern Germany and Russia. Much has been said, and much will be said, about the rivalry of the Germans and the Slavs, and the inveterate and instinctive hatred which these two races feel for each other; but these instincts are not different from those which you will find wherever you find two different races, and more powerful than these natural feelings are the natural affinities, I would almost say necessities, which tie historically Northern Germany and Russia. Both have been imprisoned in the parts of Europe least favored by nature; both look with envy on the South, on the countries of the sun—on the rich lands of Canaan; both have strong governments, which do not allow themselves to be ruled by vulgar or popular prejudices, which keep their traditions, which can conceal their plans, mature their projects. Since the time of the partition of Poland, the House of Hohenzollern and the Romanoffs have felt that they had a common cause. You can follow the thread of the same idea in the history of these

two houses. Whenever Prussia is afraid of Russia, and wants to draw her nearer to herself, she has but to pronounce one word—Poland! Whenever Russia sees herself abandoned by Prussia and threatened by the German forces, she has but to pronounce the word Austria! Russia was, in 1870, the best ally of Northern Germany, and Bismarck has shown his great intelligence in not being ungrateful to Russia. He did not copy the policy of Austria. When this empire was saved by the Russian arms, at the time of the Hungarian rebellion, an Austrian statesman said, "Austria will astonish the world by her ingratitude." She did astonish the world not only by her ingratitude, but by the extent of the misfortunes which followed. As she had abandoned Russia at the time of the Crimean war, Russia abandoned her when she became the prey of Italy, of France, of Prussia; Solferino and Sadowa taught her a lesson which was almost too severe.

Prince Bismarck is a thorough German, but he is not a German of the Metternichian school; he is a Prussian German, and he knows what has been the value of the Russian alliance to his country. The book of Klaczko, "Two Chancellors," was written in order to show of what service Russia has been to Germany, and the Polish author hoped, by ridiculing Prince Gortchakoff and laughing at his insolence, to separate the two Chancellors from each other. He has not succeeded; the German Chancellor has paid, and is still paying, his debts to the Russian Chancellor. Since the beginning of the Eastern difficulties, during the tedious discussions of the Conference at Constantinople, Russia was always supported by Germany, and she has slowly but surely advanced towards her end.

A great portion of the European press has long maintained that Germany was laying traps for Russia—that Prince Bismarck wished to embark his allies in some insoluble difficulties. For a long time nobody would even believe that war would take place. But now the Russians have crossed the Danube, they have crossed the Balkans, and their military operations are conducted with an extraordinary vigor. I advise all the detractors of Russia to read the official report of the Grand Duke on the crossing of the Danube; they will see that the Russians have lost nothing as soldiers; they are the sons of the men who gave their lives at Eylau. Their leaders have learnt the art of war from German professors; the men are always the same—obedient, always ready to give their lives for the Czar and for the Christian faith. The present war in Turkey is a true crusade, and I for one should be very much surprised if the Russian army was not allowed to enter Constantinople. How great in history would be the Czar who had proclaimed emancipation, and who should again bring the cross into the Church of Saint Sophia!

I will note here a curious symptom of the time. Everybody must be convinced now that Germany and Russia are in close alliance; nevertheless, the sympathies of the French are chiefly on the Russian side. There is only a small minority which sides with the Turks; the nation, instinctively, is drawn towards the Russians. It obeys in this case a generous and chivalrous sentiment more than its self-interest, as it is obvious that if Russia succeeds in her enterprise she will have, in her turn, a heavy debt of gratitude to pay to Germany. Just as Bismarck is now keeping off the powers who meditate opposing the Russian plans, Russia might be afterwards employed to keep off the enemies of Germany. In fact, the alliance of the two youngest nations having the two largest territorial forces in Europe seems to be becoming the governing power of Europe. England, as well as the Latin races, will find herself controlled, overpowered, stifled by the pressure of the twin colossi of middle and northern Europe. The end of this century will witness, perhaps, scenes similar to those which were seen when the German races pressed against the frontiers of the Roman Empire. Nobody knows as yet exactly what limit Russia has assigned to herself in her present enterprise; but war is such a costly speculation in our age that, even looking at it from a purely material point of view, she cannot be contented without some solid advantages. If we regard the moral commotion which has been excited in the Russian people, we must also conclude that great satisfactions must be given to this people by its government; the revenge of the Crimean War must be complete, and the victory of the Christians against the Moslems must be definitive. I am no more inclined to believe in a sham campaign, in a military promenade, than I was inclined to believe in peace at the beginning of the Eastern difficulties. If my point of view is correct, Europe may still have to expect great complications. It will be difficult to drag England into the war; she is not willing to *drift* again; at the same time she is becoming more and more restless and uneasy; her pride suffers, though she would like to conceal her sufferings. She hesitates between what is due to prudence and what she thinks due to her own position in the world. If, unfortunately, the combative element



which is always dormant in her should come uppermost; if England should take some of those resolutions which cannot be retraced, we may expect to have very soon afterwards the whole of Europe in a ferment. The doors of the temple of Janus would then have to be open for years. There is, therefore, nothing abnormal in the general uneasiness which is felt throughout the Old World, and the industrial crisis is only one of its signs.

## Correspondence.

### THE MAINE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The action of the recent Republican Convention in Maine is of sufficient interest, as a supposed indication of the sentiment of the party in New England, to warrant some explanation of the manner in which it was brought about, and some mention of the causes which led to it.

Mr. Blaine seems to be considered the "manager" of the Convention and the author of its policy; but, while it is true that his personal influence and remarkable popularity in the party undoubtedly had a considerable effect upon the delegates of his own immediate section; while it is true that he "manipulated" the Convention; introduced, through a faithful follower, the hostile resolution which gave him the opportunity to make his "pacifying" speech; and that he probably prepared the ingenious resolutions which have caused so much amusement—and indignation—among the large portion of the party friendly to the Administration; still his influence was not the only, and, indeed, not the most powerful, cause of the result.

The Republican party in Maine, though generally thoughtful and intelligent, is, perhaps more than in any other New England State, governed by the opinions of its representative men. It is easy to discover the sources of Mr. Blaine's popularity among his constituency, and to estimate the feeling of personal disappointment which his defeat at Cincinnati caused throughout his State. That defeat made him friends from those who had previously been hostile or lukewarm, and gave him a popular following such as he never had before. But the western part of the State, which Mr. Blaine is supposed to represent, as Mr. Hamlin the eastern, is *not* opposed to the Administration. The counties of Cumberland and York, which are the richest and most populous in the State, and which, being commercial and manufacturing, are less likely to be governed by impulse and prejudice than those mainly agricultural, are, if not warmly in favor of the Administration, at least desirous that its policy should have a fair and unopposed trial. It is possible (as has been asserted but not proved) that a majority of the delegates to the recent Convention were not of that belief; but the organization is still in the hands of "the machine," and those familiar with the operation of managing primary meetings in country villages will easily understand how little difficulty "the machine" would have in securing delegates to its liking.

In what is considered Mr. Hamlin's part of the State the condition of things was entirely different. There public sentiment is generally opposed to the Administration and bitterly hostile to its policy. The notorious Etna resolutions are no exaggerated indication of the feelings of the people of northeastern Maine. This state of affairs is due almost entirely to Mr. Hamlin's personal influence and efforts, increased, of course, by the advice and assistance of Mr. Blaine. It is inevitable that Mr. Hamlin should oppose the Administration, for it is governed by principles which he has been fighting throughout his political life. He rose to position through little other ability than that of an accomplished politician, and he has retained his place and power by the use of those political ways and means which it is the avowed purpose of the President to render impossible. Naturally, however, though civil-service reform is the most offensive feature of the Administration policy to Mr. Hamlin and his henchmen, they hardly dare to make *that* the foundation of their attack upon it. They sneer at it; they say it is all very well as a theory but impossible to practise, that it will do very well in Arcadia or when the millennium arrives; but their souls are roused with righteous indignation against the "Southern policy." "The infamous Southern policy" has been the text of the leading articles of pretty much all the newspapers in the northeastern part of the State for months; and these articles, which apparently sprung from a single source, have been so violent, so malignant, and so inflammatory, that, coupled with the private influence of Mr. Hamlin and his friends—a very great one—they have succeeded in arousing throughout that section a public feeling which was fairly indicated

by the "Etna resolutions" and feebly by the action of the Convention. When a Republican Senator of the United States says publicly, as one is said to have done, "that he would not vote for the candidates of a convention which approved the infamous Southern policy of the President," it is not wonderful that the constituency which he manages so completely should reflect his opinions.

The real cause of the hostility to the Administration of both Senators from Maine and of all its Representatives, with perhaps a single exception, arises from the fact that the Administration policy in regard to the manipulating of politics by office-holders will deprive the party leaders of the material aid which has thus far enabled them to remain leaders. It is true, as one of Mr. Blaine's resolutions states, that the official record of Federal office-holders in Maine is, as far as regards actual malfeasance in office, perfectly clear. But it is also true that the entire management of the party organization has been in their hands, and used to their own advantage and for the advantage of the men who made them office-holders, without any particular regard for the interests of the public service. "Hence these tears."

Such are some of the causes which led to the action of the Convention. On the management of its deliberations, if that term can be applied to proceedings which hardly failed of being riotous, Mr. Blaine displayed his usual consummate ability, not to say sharpness. The chairman was a man of his own choice, and when it was discovered that the original programme of silence in regard to the Administration was to be broken by the introduction of a moderate resolution commendatory of the President, it was, as we have said before, a personal follower of Mr. Blaine who introduced the carefully-studied hostile resolution (which it is believed was inspired if not prepared by the Senator himself) that gave an opportunity for the "pacifying" speech, and afforded an apparent justification for the action of the Convention.

While it would be untrue to say that a majority of the Republicans of Maine are opposed to the policy of the Administration, it is idle to disguise the fact that many of them are bitterly opposed to it. The feeling in its favor, however, is growing every day, and Mr. Blaine's influence with the better portion of the party is every day growing weaker. Republicans are becoming disgusted, not only with the political ideas which can only thrive upon the hotbed of violence and commotion, but with the means whereby such ideas are falsely made to appear the governing ideas of a great party. The coming election will not probably be affected by any dissatisfaction in the party, however great it may be. Governor Connor is not only an unexceptionable candidate, but he is popular, and deservedly so, among the men who feel most aggrieved at the action of the Convention. Besides, there is nothing to be hoped for from the Democrats of Maine. The action of their Convention will be taken before this can be printed; but there is no hazard in predicting that they will *not* do anything to take advantage of any possible dissatisfaction among Republicans, and *will* do everything that they can to strengthen Messrs. Hamlin and Blaine, and the other manipulators of the "machine."

M.

PORTLAND, ME., August 14, 1877.

### THE LABORING MAN AND THE CAPITALIST.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The discontent that led to the recent outbreak has not been removed by the dozen volleys and hundred proclamations fired at the rioters. It had its roots in actual suffering, and its cure is to be found rather in diminishing the causes of discomfort among the poor than in increasing the national police. It is easy to say that the poor are their own worst enemies. This is only half true. The wage-getters have not lowered their expenses in proportion to the fall in wages. They are in many ways recklessly extravagant. But a low standard of subsistence among laborers is a recognized economic evil. A desire on their part for better houses, better clothing, better food, more leisure, is in itself a good thing, and they are little or not at all responsible for many of the causes of their present suffering in the United States—such as the lack of proper municipal regulations for sewers, light, air, and water; the insufficiency of school accommodations; the non-existence of compulsory education; the needlessly high prices of the necessities of life, due to the tariff and the currency; and the general control of legislation in this country by capital.

This last is a deadly evil, for it makes the state—the agent and the representative of the social organism—the apparent enemy of the laboring man. He has his tiny fortune swept from him by the failure of savings-banks while the thieves go unpunished, and he knows that post-office

savings-banks have been proved practicable and cannot fail. If the slow robbery of savings-banks were as injurious to capital comparatively as it is to labor, how long would it be before every safeguard the law could bring to bear would be thrown about such institutions? The laborer sees that legal redress for wrong is a costly luxury beyond his reach, and he knows, or ought to know, that the *Conseils des Prudhommes* of France, the Courts of Conciliation of Denmark, and the semi-legal Boards of Arbitration of England have put justice in those countries, at least in certain things, within the reach of his foreign fellows. He finds it almost impossible to invest safely his scanty savings, and he sees France offering her bonds directly to the people while the United States refuses to do so, save in a cumbersome method and in too high denominations. In view of recent insurance and railroad revelations it is not too bold a thing to say that the workingman sees certain forms of theft either legalized or made safe for the capitalist. When "property" and "robbery" are thus brought into juxtaposition it is not unnatural that he should sometimes follow Proudhon in thinking them to be interconvertible terms.

Dishonesty by capitalists, allowed or at any rate unpunished by law, has borne with especial weight upon the railroad employee. If dividends must be paid upon watered stock; if interest must be paid on the large portion of the cost of road-bed, rolling-stock, repairs, and running expenses due to a protective tariff; if fast-freight lines and palace-cars, in which the officers of a railway are part owners, are allowed to absorb a considerable percentage of the rightful income of the road; if the mad ambition to be a "railway king" fastens leeches along every trunk-line in the shape of unproductive branches; then, in all these cases, the fund for the payment of wages is necessarily and greatly diminished. We do not have to go far from Chicago to find a road which not long since issued stock that trustees eagerly bought and which then paid living wages. Now that the main line is loaded with costly mementos of the late management, such as leased and branch roads, it cannot afford to pay the men who work upon it their fair share of what it earns. Is it worth while to keep sacred the contracts which A., B., and C., as managers of the main line, made with themselves as owners of the side-tracks, when the price of their sacredness is the creation of a proletariat and the steady manufacture of mob-material?

The intelligent Malthusian and the sentimentalist shrieker against the humane and rational teachings of Malthus, may both well shrink from the fact that to-day, in the United States, the workingman who marries makes a fool of himself. The ruling rate of wages taboos the family. The American artisan is offered his choice between celibacy and want.

If we would prevent or even postpone a worse outbreak in the near future, we must consider these things. Without going too far in the dangerous path of socialism, I may venture the assertion that legislation and public opinion, acting together, can and should materially better the condition of the laboring classes by the enforcement of proper sanitary regulations; by the provision of proper facilities for education, and the enforcement of their use; by the resumption of specie payments; by holding savings-bank trustees and all corporation managers to a rigid accountability, and subjecting their acts to a strict supervision; by selling United States bonds, in denominations of \$20, at every national bank; by simplifying and quickening the administration of justice; and by forbidding henceforth and for ever the robbery of the many by the few, which is legalized and upheld by a protective tariff.

ALFRED B. MASON.

CHICAGO, August 6, 1877.

[There is a great deal of truth in the foregoing, and every word of it is worthy of consideration. It is on matters such as Mr. Mason brings up that the late Presidential canvass ought to have run, and it is to such matters that we, as far as we could, tried to call the attention of the orators last summer, as the best mode of preparing the public for intelligent legislative action on them. Instead of this the campaign was passed in a wild and wicked crusade against the South, as a part of a deliberate attempt by notorious political jobbers to divert attention from their own misdeeds and hiding-places. The result is that the winter and spring have been again filled with scandalous revelations, which find the community surprised, helpless, and bewildered. But Mr. Mason's facts do not bear out all his conclusions. It is not true, for instance, that this country is governed by capital. Capital often gains its ends, but only by legitimate means. As illustrations of its feebleness, we need only cite its

inability to procure a repeal of the usury laws or to lighten the burden of bank taxation in this State. Moreover, the mismanagement of railroad and insurance companies is proof not of the power and wickedness of capital, but simply of the existence of rascals among capitalists. Mr. Mason's error lies in using the term capitalist to mean rich men. It means in America and everywhere else every man who has saved any amount from his yearly expenses, and uses it, or lends it to be used, in the work of production. Life-insurers and railroad stock and bondholders, however small the amount of their premium or investments, are capitalists, and no classes have suffered so much from the frauds and mismanagement of the last ten years. In the break-down of the savings-banks the workingman suffers in just the same way, and from the same causes, as the railroad stockholder; and the state in letting the savings-banks break down is no more his enemy than the enemy of the farmers or lawyers. In what he says on this point our correspondent, with all respect be it said, is guilty of cant, and we have had enough cant about "the laboring man," and more than is good for him. He is suffering as regards the security of his savings, as we are all suffering in one way or another, from the want of intelligent legislation, and honest and efficient administration; and capitalists (*i.e.*, the saving, frugal class, who live within their means) suffer far more from it than "the laboring man" who spends every cent he earns. Of course a high standard of subsistence on the part of the laboring class is a great good, but only if accompanied by a high intelligence and morality. In that one case it makes the laborer careful, energetic, industrious, and eager to excel in his calling. If, however, his morality and intelligence do not keep pace with his standard of living, "the desire for better clothing, better food, and more leisure" either converts him into a cantankerous trade-unionist, enforcing rules for the suppression of merit and the exaltation of laziness and incapacity, or else a Molly Maguire, carrying out his social theories through blood and fire, and fit only to be knocked on the head.

Mr. Mason, too, overlooks the fundamental fact that the laboring man in America counts, as a voter, as the equal of every other man, and that no provision can be or is likely to be made for his wants without his own initiative or support. There are no arrangements here for taking charge of him as a minor, and there is no accepted theory under which we can do so. How much weight he has as a voter, even in the low estate of an incendiary and robber and obstructor of the public highways, is well illustrated by the shameless platform of the Ohio Republicans; and the condition of municipal government in several of the large cities is the direct result of his exercise of a power which nobody would dare to deny him. This being the case, we see no way of making an exception of him which can stop short of giving the country into his hands, and letting him convert it into a huge national workshop. If we do not do this, he must take his chance with the rest of us, contribute his share to the rational exposure of abuses and the suggestion of rational remedies, and suffer with the rest of the world, as best he may, the consequences of hard times, including celibacy. As a railroad employee, he suffers no more from the misdeeds of capitalists than clerks or mill-hands. As such he forms a member of a large and conspicuous class, but this hardly justifies his blocking traffic on the national highways.—ED. NATION.]

## Notes.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS announce the following timely works: 'How Shall the Nation Regain Prosperity?' by David A. Wells; 'Money and Legal Tender in the United States,' by H. R. Lindemann, Director of the United States Mint; 'Economics; or, the Science of Wealth,' a manual for the use of higher classes; 'Labor and Capital,' by John B. Jervis; and a new popular edition of Adam Smith's 'Wealth of Nations.'—Harper & Bros. will shortly publish 'Caricature and Other Comic Art in All Times and Many Lands,' by James Parton, with upwards of 200 illustrations; 'Contemporary Art in Europe,' by S. G. W. Benjamin; 'The Book of Gold, and Other Poems,' by J. T. Trowbridge; and 'The



Origin of the World, according to Revelation and Science," by J. W. Dawson.—The 'Official Reports of the International Board of Judges, Centennial Exhibition,' edited by Francis A. Walker, will be published by J. B. Lippincott & Co.—Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger have in press 'Scenes and Incidents in the Peninsula Campaign.'—Macmillan & Co. announce 'Travels in Turkey and Greece,' by Hon. Dudley Campbell.—The Virginia College of William and Mary is reduced to such pecuniary straits that it is questionable whether the venerable institution will not have to be closed for ever. We believe it is now as a last resort making an appeal to Northern liberality, on which it has at least the claim that its main building was wantonly burnt by Northern troops during the war, and that Congress five years ago refused to indemnify it. It might perhaps be better for the State if the University of Virginia were without rivals; but one could not witness without regret the downfall of William and Mary, not only because of its historical associations (it is our second oldest college), but because at this juncture, when the State is demoralized on the subject of its credit, the extinguishing of the humblest focus of morals and discipline is a melancholy spectacle.—The Atlanta University, for the education of the blacks, is maintained by the State of Georgia, and a very satisfactory report upon it has just been made by a committee of the General Assembly. They found the "mental training" as exhibited in the examinations "very satisfactory," and declare that "these pupils will certainly exert a tremendous influence on their race." The hope is expressed that the graduates may be encouraged by municipal authorities to "engage in teaching their race, and in helping to make them good citizens." Their teachers (from the North) are advised not to "alienate them from their old masters and homes and from their native State," by the careless use of sectional text-books, etc.—The August number of the *Geographical Magazine* (Trübner & Co.) is of unusual interest to the general reader. Two letters on the Livingstonia mission settlement on Lake Nyassa give very encouraging accounts of this Free-Church experiment, and are illustrated by a large-scale map of the lake. An official report of Don F. P. Moreno's exploration of the River Santa Cruz to its sources supplements Captain Fitz Roy's discoveries in 1834. Besides these, there are valuable articles on affairs in Japan, the last great earthquake in Peru, the india-rubber-trees of Brazil, in defence of the British Arctic expedition, etc.—'Two Years of the Eastern Question' is the title of a work just put forth by Mr. Gallenga, the able Italian correspondent of the *London Times*, who goes by that name in literature.—It is announced that we may soon look for Professor Seeley's 'Life of Stein.'

—The discussion as to the claims put forward by General Grant, or by his principal adviser, in regard to his proper place in the social order of England, has heretofore chiefly turned upon the value in such a scale of his late title of President of the United States. There is no doubt that the attempt was made, and with all but complete success, to assimilate his elective dignity with that of an hereditary ruler, and to secure for him from the "ex-sovereign" point of view a treatment which no real ex-sovereign would be allowed or would expect to receive. In the Editor's Easy Chair of the September *Harper* the ground is shifted. So far from acknowledging the extraordinary courtesy with which on so many occasions the required precedence was accorded to a private citizen, the Editor is "bewildered" to learn that at the Prince of Wales's reception General Grant "brought up the rear of the procession to the dining-room," and he straightway convicts the Prince of extreme discourtesy, adding that rather than endure such a slight "General Grant should quietly have left the house." His reason is not that Grant was an ex-sovereign but that he was the guest in whose honor the entertainment was given; and that inasmuch as "the rules of really good society, whether titled or untitled, are everywhere the same in regard to certain essential points," "the rigidity of ceremonial forms" should in this instance have been relaxed. It is, however, only by example that we learn what are deemed "essential points" by good society among the titled; and when we find the leader of that society putting his untitled guest at the end of the procession, though having the strongest inducements to put him at the head, it is but reasonable to conclude that he is observing the rules instead of violating them, as Mr. Curtis alleges. The alternative is that the Prince of Wales's society is not "really good society," which would be begging the question. Whether the good society in which such things can happen is not inferior to other good society in which they cannot, is a separate question; and the democratic view of it being well known, Mr. Curtis had no need to enforce it upon his readers. He misleads them, it seems to us, by assuming that American opinion on this subject enables us to decide what is or what is not in accordance

with the rules of English etiquette, and to judge of their agreement in essential points with the rules of good society the world over.

—Any one who has suffered from or attempted to study the taxation laws of some States—Massachusetts, for instance—knows what a great clog they are upon the transactions of much necessary business and the associated movements of capital. To a review of some of the worst of these laws, and an exposition of their absurdity from the point of view of economic science, Mr. David A. Wells devotes an article, "Are Titles and Debts Property?" in the September *Atlantic*. His text is a legal case which may be briefly outlined thus: Mr. Kirtland, a citizen of Woodbury, Connecticut, loans money on a mortgage of real estate in Chicago, this real estate, of course, being taxed in the State of Illinois. The tax-collector of Woodbury, however, assesses Mr. Kirtland on the amount of this mortgage. Payment of this tax being refused, and the delinquent's property in Woodbury being attached and advertised for sale, the matter comes before the courts on a petition for injunction, and the case, having been decided against Mr. Kirtland by the Connecticut courts, has been carried up to the Supreme Court of the United States, where it now awaits decision. In discussing the questions of interest involved in this case Mr. Wells considers thoroughly what is properly, what are titles to property, the relation of debts to property, etc., and throws abundant light upon the injurious relations held by some States toward others in consequence of present systems of taxation. We cannot reproduce the main arguments here and should be sorry to injure their effect by abbreviation, but we earnestly advise legislators and taxpayers to read the article with care. The policy of taxing a man for debts owing to him, or of taxing the same piece of property several times over, as is now done in Massachusetts and elsewhere, is a blundering and suicidal one, which can be defended only by those who have never learned to distinguish between actual property, on the one hand, and titles and debts, on the other.

—Mr. Robert P. Porter's article on "The Municipal Debt of the United States" in the September *Galaxy* will be valuable for future reference if, as would appear, his figures are worthy of confidence. He furnishes a "table showing the debt, valuation, taxation, and population of one hundred and thirty cities of the United States for the years 1866 and 1876 respectively." The cities have been selected "so far as possible to represent the entire country"; and show for the ten years an increase of debt amounting to about 200 per cent.; an increase of annual taxation, about 83 per cent.; an increase of valuation, about 75 per cent.; and an increase of population of 33 per cent. For several important deductions from the table we refer to the article itself. The author suggests no remedy for the present recklessness in municipal management, and consequent alarming increase of indebtedness, less radical than that contained in the report of the New York Municipal Commission, which he recommends to the consideration of thoughtful minds. Mr. Grant White begins in the same number a series of articles on "Americanisms," taking his illustrations chiefly from Bartlett's Dictionary; Mr. Henry James, jr., tells of "Three Excursions"—to Epsom on the Derby day, to Hatfield House, and to Oxford at Commemoration; and Mr. Isaac Newton answers the question "Has the Day of Great Navies Passed?" in the affirmative, because of the efficiency of the torpedo.

—The awful feature of the present political situation was held up to us in one of Mr. Blaine's resolutions at Augusta, on August 9, in the following terms: "The Republicans of Maine view with solicitude and alarm the complete consolidation of all political power in the sixteen Southern States in the hands of those who precipitated the rebellion." This had been long foreseen, however, as well as the fact that nothing could prevent such a consolidation except an indefinite prolongation of the war. Thus, in October, 1864, Mr. Wendell Phillips made a speech in Boston in opposition to President Lincoln's re-election. Denouncing him for the proclamation of December 8, 1863, he said:

"Make peace on the basis of that amnesty proclamation, and you increase the evil a thousand-fold. These men, the moment that our army returns, will wield those States against us, and, while they crush the negro at home, will send to Washington the same conspirators to cripple the Union that they did before 1860. No theory of State government can deny their full right to do so. Slavery out of the question, I should myself defend their clear right so to use their power."

Reconstruction was in fact immediately begun on the basis laid down in that proclamation; and constituencies composed of at least one-tenth of the number of voters at the Presidential election of 1860 were recog-

nized in each State as the true government, and protected by the Federal forces, in accordance with the Constitutional guaranty of the "republican form," against invasion and domestic violence. Mr. Phillips saw in this procedure, however, not a sincere attempt to resuscitate the lapsed civil order, but a selfish design to secure Mr. Lincoln's own re-election. In the course of the speech from which we have already quoted he said:

"The President manipulates into existence sham military boards in Tennessee, Arkansas, and Louisiana, baptizes them State governments, and it is asserted by a leading Republican Senator that they are to be and ought to be permitted to vote in the Presidential election. . . . If Mr. Lincoln should use such votes and be elected by them, no citizen would be bound to submit to his election; every lover of constitutional liberty would be bound to resist it in the best way he could."

It is well known that the electoral votes of those States were not counted by Congress, and that Mr. Lincoln gave due notice before the election that he should not interfere with the exclusive powers of that body in the premises. Nevertheless, Mr. Phillips's supposed case is interesting from its analogy to the actual occurrences of the last election, where we had sham canvassing boards in place of sham military boards, "manipulated into existence" not by the President but by the party, for the perpetuation of its power, and which did elect the Republican candidate. But the Radicals were no longer heard exclaiming that "no citizen would be bound to submit to [Mr. Hayes's] election"; and that "every lover of constitutional liberty" had a duty to perform in resisting it.

—The services of the Seventh Regiment to this city and to the country are too well known to need recalling here. The regiment began last year to build a new armory for itself, having a fund of \$80,000, three-fourths of which was subscribed by its active and past members. This fund is now in urgent need of increase, and the building committee appeals to the business men of New York to help raise the sum of \$200,000 without adding to the debt or taxation of the city. The Committee naturally make use of the late unhappy disorders, which our New York and Brooklyn soldiery had so honorable a part in suppressing, as a powerful argument in favor of this appeal. We hope it will not go unheeded by our moneyed men, and by all who realize the importance of preventing mob violence, as every year makes more precious and irreplaceable the accumulations of art, science, and literature in all the great cities of the world. A national police will be useful when we get it, but meantime it is our plain duty to cherish the admirable organizations which we already have for home defence. Subscriptions to the Seventh Regiment New Armory Fund may be sent to the trustees of it, Messrs. Robert Lenox Kennedy, Royal Phelps, and W. W. Astor, or to R. M. Weed, Regimental Treasurer, 184 Front Street.

—We have received from Mr. Christern the first three parts of the Supplement to Littré's monumental 'Dictionnaire de la Langue Française.' The last volume of the main work contained fifty pages of "Additions and Corrections." These have all been embodied in the present Supplement, which embraces still further rectifications, terms of art, science, and agriculture, neologisms, provincialisms, etc., etc. In his chatty preface M. Littré expatiates on each of these classes. He has obtained for many words proof of greater age than is allowed in the Dictionary: thus, *gaieté* is now traced beyond the sixteenth century, and *hospitalité*, which had no genealogy before, has acquired a very respectable one. All words were at some time neologisms, and M. Littré has learned that so indispensable a word as *analogie* was apologetically introduced by Henri Etienne (1460-1521). Among foreign words that have not held their own he points out *goudale* (English "good ale"), used by thirteenth-century writers, now retained only in the derivative *godailier*. Of provincialisms he says that they often complete a derivative series, often rest upon authentic archaisms, and, being "mots d'excellente frappe," offset the tendency to reckless innovations. M. Littré has profited by the recent scientific discussions of the origin of words and by the liberal contributions of friends. He makes a merited acknowledgment of the services of his assistants, MM. Beaugé, Jullien, Baudry, and André. The work will be completed in twelve parts, uniform in all respects with the Dictionary.

—A Supplement like this is almost fit for continuous reading—fully as much so, we think, as 'Men of the Time,' with which from one point of view it might be compared. Thus, among the new words one is rather surprised to find such old (English) acquaintances as *climax*, *elephantomanie*; but greets as a matter of course *Darwinien*, *Darwinisme*, and *Darwiniste*. The French word-maker, if allowed full swing, will presently rival the German capacity for polysyllables: thus, a police ordinance of June 14, 1873, coins *d'approvisionnement*, and almost as many

letters are employed in *chirographairement*, *déchristianisation*, and *désharmoniquement*. A new use of *décolletage* is noted, with an example from *Figaro*—"le corsage échancré en pointe selon le décolletage dit à l'américain"—and another from the *Temps* of Jan. 10, 1877, p. 2, col. 5, as we are told with great preciseness. *Doctoresse* has acquired a new signification, as not merely a woman who practises, but one who has received the doctorate in medicine, e.g.: "Sur la demande d'une dame médecin, Mme. la doctoresse Anderson" (*Journal Officiel*, Dec. 23, 1871, p. 5265, col. 3). In these last two instances the Supplement gives us contemporary history. Under the very first word, *à*, we have an interesting example of a popular and archaic use of this preposition in a possessive sense: "Joinville disait comme nos paysans: La comtesse Marie qui fut sœur au roi de France"—just as we say, "sister to the king." Under *Chat* we get two nice idioms: "Fait comme les quatre chats," i.e., with dress all disordered; and "Il n'y avait que le chat," there were no witnesses. Proceeding to the proverb, "il ne faut pas éveiller le chat qui dort," Littré remarks that an example of this occurs in the fifteenth century, but in the thirteenth century they said, "le chien qui dort." He thinks the substitution of cat for dog the result of a misapprehension, since it is the watch-dog who must not be aroused. We should have supposed that the proverb referred to the ferocity shown by the cat tribe on being suddenly disturbed while sleeping. Under *Czar* we are told that in French the word is spelled in four ways, *czar*, *esar*, *tzar*, *tsar*—the first two forms as if from Caesar, an etymological blunder which Voltaire exposes in his 'Charles XII.,' although he uses the forms *czar* and *czarafs*. Time was, before Peter the Great, when "czarevitch," or son of the *tzar* (king), was a proper enough form: but he is now called, as son of the emperor, "tzezarevitch," i.e., the son of Caesar.

### THREE NOVELS.\*

NOT many of Anthony Trollope's readers can recall the rage excited more than fifty years ago in America by his mother's coarse and flippant satire on our national manners, not only in her book of travels but in her forgotten novel of 'Jonathan Jefferson Whitelaw.' Mrs. Trollope regretted these tirades seriously before she died, if we may judge by her kindness to our countrymen at her home in Florence. Her son has in more than one book done his best to make Americans believe, what no one who talks with him ten minutes can doubt, that he is their very good friend. In the true spirit of diplomatic intercourse, even after laying himself out to make fun of us in a novel, he couples the jokes with an assurance of his most distinguished consideration. For instance, 'He Knew He was Right,' a story in parts not merely painful but disgusting, was relieved by the character of an American young lady with whom an English nobleman falls in love. She comes either from Illinois or Providence or Boston—Mr. Trollope does not leave it quite clear which. Her father or uncle—there is a like vagueness here—the United States Minister at Florence, is given to haranguing Europeans rather at length, and her bosom friend, Miss Wallachia Petrie, is a trying type of the advocate for the elevation of her sex. Miss Caroline herself is well enough, and amply consoles Lord Peterborough for the loss of the heroine. Mr. Trollope has worked very hard to make her interesting and her surroundings amusing, without raising a laugh at anything that is not fair game.

And yet she is not likely to satisfy Americans; and for the same reasons that will make the 'American Senator' unsatisfactory. The Hon. Elias Gotobed, Senator of the United States from the State of Mikewa, has made the acquaintance in Washington of John Morton, one of the heroes of the novel, a rising young diplomatist. On his return to England the Senator accompanies him to study English institutions, and digest his information into a lecture, to be delivered first in London and ultimately in America. The part he plays in the plot is not very important, and the author confesses at the end that the book might as well have been called by some other name. But the senator's part is the most elaborately written, and, fair or unfair in its satire, the pleasantest to read. The rest is chiefly a couple of matrimonial affairs, one with and one without heart, not unamusing, but very conventional, and in parts disagreeable, not to say repulsive. The style of these chapters strongly confirms the hint which has reached us from England, that Mr. Trollope is beginning to "let out" portions of his novels to less renowned assistants.

\* 'The American Senator: A Novel. By Anthony Trollope.' New York: Harpers, 1877.

Samuel Brohl et Cie. Par Victor Cherbuliez. New York: F. W. Clarendon. Samuel Brohl and Company. Translated from the French of M. Victor Cherbuliez. New York: D. Appleton & Co.  
'Coronation: A Story of Forest and Sea. By E. P. Tenney.' Boston: Noyes, & Co.



Mr. Gotobed tries hard by enquiry and personal inspection to understand English institutions; and fails. He collects facts painfully, and draws wrong conclusions; when Englishmen do so in America, we call it English stupidity. He criticises England in a trenchant manner, with no want of truth, but great want of regard for English feeling; when Englishmen do this in America, we call it English rudeness. He finds English amusements dull and English systems partial, and refuses to admit that their satisfying the people is any argument in their favor. We call a similar trait insular arrogance. He cannot resist the charm of delicacy and softness in English country-houses, but looks on it as a kind of degenerate luxury, fit only for the slaves of tyranny, and unworthy of the armies of progress. We call the like tone in Englishmen towards what we have of comfort and geniality patronizing superciliousness and conceit. He ends by delivering a lecture, consisting chiefly of facts unfortunately put, whereby he succeeds in annoying a well-disposed audience, so that when a riotous crowd threatens to break in no one is anxious to secure him a full hearing, and he is got out as best he may be. Mr. Trollope knows best if this is the fate of American lecturers in England; it is not that of English lecturers here.

But Mr. Gotobed is most unfortunate in connection with fox-hunting. The author has already taken up the cudgels in defence of this national sport against the historian Freeman; and a large part of this novel is devoted to its exaltation—not without a very fair exhibition of some of its absurdities. A fox is found dead, and the vulpicide—greatest of English rural crimes—is brought home to a worthless character named Goadly, whom everybody in the localities of the novel has always loathed and now hates as he would an advanced thinker. The Senator, despising fox-hunting, and convinced that in England the heel of the proud is on the neck of the lowly, spends his time and his money to get Goadly fair play, gets thoroughly cheated, annoys everybody by meddling, wears out an originally warm welcome, and somehow has to confess that though by American political philosophy he ought to be all right, by English practical sense he is all wrong.

Opening the novel absolutely at random, we light on this specimen of the Senator's talk:

"That's what provokes me," said the Senator. "You think he's a rascal, mister?"

"I do."

"And because you take upon yourself to think so, you'd send him to Rufford Jail! There was one gentleman somewhere about here told me he ought to be hung; and because I would not agree with him he got up and walked away from me at table, carrying his provisions with him. The clergyman in Dillsborough and the hotel-keepers were just as hard upon me. But you see, mister, what we want to find out is whether Goadly or the lord has the right of it in this particular case."

Quite too like an American, Lord Herbert, is it not? Only, Lady Edith, it isn't.

'Samuel Brohl and Company' relates the adventures of one Abel Larinski, a Polish count; Samuel Brohl, a German Jew; and Mlle. Antoinette Moriaz, a very charming French girl. The plot turns on a sufficiently probable personation of the count (who is really dead) by the living Jew, of his complete deception of the charming heroine, and the final terrible *décalreissement*, when she discovers her mistake and the real character of the shameless Brohl is revealed. There is, of course, another lover, an honest boy, between whom and the heroine the family and friends are anxious to see a match, but for whom she feels no more than a sisterly attachment, until in the end he succeeds in arousing a deeper interest through his gallant behavior in a duel with Brohl. All the characters are drawn with Cherbuliez's usual delicacy of touch. An adventurer who personates some one else is no very new type in the fiction of any country, but Samuel Brohl is an adventurer *sui generis*. An ordinary novelist would probably have either resorted to the stale device of keeping back the secret of the identity of the Jew scamp with the person who is in possession of the family documents of the late count, to the end of the book, or, if he had chosen to take the reader into his confidence, would have exaggerated the success of the deception. Cherbuliez does neither. The false Larinski, consummate actor as he is, thoroughly deceives no one, any more than he would in real life, except the poor girl, who, more used to the ways of romance than to those of the world, comes so near being his victim. Her father suspects him; her aunt feels confident that something is wrong, and her lover feels sure of it. They make all the enquiries that persons in their position would naturally make, and are only foiled by the accidental, or rather felonious, possession by the false count of convincing proofs of his assumed identity.

Cherbuliez's young women are always charming, especially so,

probably, to English and American readers because they are more like English or American than French girls. It is the fashion of the present day to regard all national or local prejudices as marks of philistinism, but the preference expressed in the old song for the "girls about home," though felt the world over from Borrioboola-Gha to Far Cathay, is nowhere so well justified (we say it at the risk of forfeiting our reputation for cosmopolitanism) by the facts as it is in America and England. Cherbuliez's young woman continually suggests a half-English or American parentage, and may in truth be called a sort of foreign idealization of an Anglo-Saxon "girl."

Comparing 'Samuel Brohl & Company' with Cherbuliez's other books, we find almost the only common trait to be their cleverness. They are all as different from one another as it is possible for novels to be. In the 'Comte Kostia' we have parental tyranny, true love, and adventure; in 'Joseph Noirel' we have love and crime; in 'Samuel Brohl' we have love and crime of a very different sort; in all we have characters of the most widely opposed types, all equally well done; in all we are haunted by a faint suspicion that there is a little too much cleverness for complete success. Such a suspicion is, of course, another piece of philistinism. Art exists for the sake of art, and novels are written not to convert the heathen, or to point a moral, but simply to tell a story. Such, at least, is the cosmopolitan view, which looks down with contempt on the narrow notion that all forms of art attain a higher level if they contain an ethical purpose—a delusion which it is only fair to say in passing led in a great measure to the production of almost all the novels of Dickens, and most of those of Thackeray. If Cherbuliez had an ethical aim in his novels it would be difficult to guess what it might be. But he has none; he is a clever producer of stories, written, to speak musically, in almost every key, but he is, nevertheless, rather more of a moralist than most French writers of fiction, only incidentally so.

The scene of 'Samuel Brohl' is in Switzerland and France, and the time modern, as may be inferred from the closing paragraphs, which show that the author manages to keep "posted" as to what is going on on this side of the Atlantic among the gentry who ply the dangerous trade of the false Abel Larinski:

"We have failed to learn what Samuel Brohl is doing in America. In waiting for something better, has he become a humble teacher? Has he attempted a new matrimonial enterprise? Has he become a reporter of the New York Herald, or a politician in one of the Northern States, or a carpet-bagger in South Carolina? Does he dream of being some day President of the glorious republic with the starry banner?"

"Up to the present time, no American journal has devoted the shortest paragraph to him. Adventurers are beings who constantly vanish and reappear; they belong to the family of divers; but after many plunges they always end by some catastrophe. The wave supports the drowning man an instant, then bears him away and drags him down to the depths of the briny abyss; there is heard a splash, a ripple, a hoarse cry, followed by a smothered groan, and Samuel Brohl is no more! For some days the question is agitated whether his real name was Brohl, Kicks, or Larinski; soon something else is talked about, and his memory becomes a prey to eternal silence."

The title of 'Coronation' comes under Sir Walter Scott's rule, inasmuch as it gives no clue whatever to its contents. The word is used only on the last page, and then in the sense of fulfilment or completion. The book might rather be called 'Walks and Talks' than a story of any kind, the plot being little less than comic in the reiterated employment of that well-worn character, the English detective, who three times scours the Continent in search of the same person, and yet in his emotional and devotional turn reminds us of him who was "no waiter, but a Knight Templar."

'Coronation' describes the rise and progress of two young men whose intimacy began literally in the cradle, and who roamed the woods and shore of Cape Anne (as Mr. Tenney desires it to be called) in storm and shine, by day and night, talking together and meditating or praying apart, from childhood until the story ends. There is a strongly religious atmosphere in the book, and the tales of spiritual wrestlings and strivings are interwoven with descriptions of the woods and the ocean vivid as the visions that rise before the young enthusiasts. The two are learned in woodcraft, and find food wherever they need it, luring trout out of the brook with a string carried in the pocket, boiling eggs in a birch-bark kettle, brewing tea from spruce tips, and having altogether about them a delightful flavor of the woods. Though the speakers are apparently Calvinists, there is no cropping out of doctrine in the book; to nourish and build up the inward life and to help his fellow-creatures to the best things are the aims for which the hero (?), Cephas, toils, and though outwardly his efforts meet only failure, the tone of the book recalls the say-

ing that "success is not in the event." Wholesome, hopeful, and faithful the book is, showing an individuality in the author a little like some of the wild fruits on which his wanderers feed. We recommend "Coronation" to the enforced dwellers in cities. They can skip the descriptions, and will feel while they read as if they too went

"Plod-plod along the featureless sand,"  
and caught the blowing surf on their face.

#### ALGER'S 'LIFE OF FORREST.'

CARLYLE has said that a well-written life is as rare as a well-spent one. The life of Edwin Forrest was not spent nor has it been written so as to command unqualified approval. The book before us is not a model biography; it is elaborate, painstaking, exact, in general just and pleasantly free from fulsome eulogy of its subject; but it is also diffuse, prolix, lacking in proper chronological proportion, full of repetitions, and crammed with impertinent digressions. Above all, it is too long. The life of Forrest was well worth writing, and worth writing well, but his career did not call for upwards of eight hundred octavo pages, and in point of fact half of these pages are superfluous. Chapter after chapter is cumbered with wholly extraneous matter—the "psychological origin, variety, and personal uses of the dramatic art," the "historic evolution and social uses of the dramatic art," and the "hostility of the church and the theatre."

Although the bulk of the book will deter many readers, the biography is one with which all dramatic critics and students of the stage must needs be familiar. It will do much for the memory of Forrest. It will no longer be possible for any one to think of the actor as a burly ruffian whose legs and lungs were more powerful than his brain. Mr. Alger shows him to us as a lover of his art, a student of Shakspeare, a man with a tender heart and an open purse. At the age of twenty-one he was able to command a salary of two hundred dollars a night. Ignorant, conceited, and successful, he educated himself; he worked hard at his profession; he travelled and studied; he neglected no opportunity of self-improvement. As an actor, he aimed at the best; his execution, always direct, became at last more and more refined; the boy at nineteen had dared to play *King Lear*; at sixty there was but little lacking in the awful picture the man then presented of that majestic ruin. Side by side with his good points his biographer shows the bad—his pride, his prejudice, his profanity, his brooding of no contradiction, his brooding over an insult or an injury. In his career there was something characteristically American, and even in the man himself Mr. Alger sees something typical of his nationality: "If occasionally in some things he practised the American vice—self-will, unconscious bigotry entrenched in a shedding conceit—he prevailing exemplified the American virtue: tolerance, frankness, generosity." Mr. Alger also finds him "American in his exaggerated dislike and contempt for the aristocratic classes and monarchic usages of the Old World." This feeling, now passing away from amongst us, if indeed it has existed at all since the war, was in part the cause of the most melancholy event in Forrest's career—the quarrel with Macready and the resulting riot and bloodshed. With the diary of Macready and this official biography before us, it is possible to consider anew the whole affair.

Macready and Forrest had been friends during the early visits of each to the country of the other. The English actor welcomed the American to London, and when he in turn became a traveller he put up at Forrest's house in this city. In 1844 Macready left America, disappointed with his audiences, although he had made money. A few months later Forrest again visited England. By most of the papers, including the *Times* and the *Athenæum*, he was praised, but in one weekly paper, edited by a firm friend of Macready, Forrest was treated with marked contempt and insult. One night Forrest was hissed under such circumstances as to leave no doubt that the intention was deliberate; he thought that he could trace in this also the influence of Macready. The suspicion, perhaps, was not unnatural for him to have then, but no reader of Macready's 'Diary' will now believe it well founded. Although Macready, who, in America must have seen himself frequently compared with Forrest to his own disadvantage, had, as he records, a great "vanity or avidity for notice or praise," and although, as he again records, he "started at every shadow of an actor, living in constant dread of being ousted from popu-

larity by some new favorite," he was altogether above anything of this sort. But Forrest, believing Macready to have secretly caused him to be hissed, hissed Macready openly. This discourteous and ill-advised act opened a deadly breach. When Macready next came to this country he was indiscreet enough to make restless and uneasy allusions to organized conspiracy against him. In Philadelphia he was hissed, and he then took occasion to refer to Forrest by name. An angry correspondence followed, in which Forrest did not appear to advantage. Mr. Alger, we notice, omits his "card" in answer to Macready's speech. In May, 1849, both actors were engaged in New York. Party feeling ran high here; Forrest was a Democrat, and among many of the rabid Democrats he was held a hero whose wrongs were to be avenged. On May 8 Macready made his first appearance, and was most shamefully treated; he was hissed and hooted, and eggs, copper cents, and even chairs were thrown on the stage. Disinclined to appear again, Macready yielded to the public request of the leading citizens of New York and was announced for Friday. It became at once evident that the brutality of Tuesday would be repeated. For this disorder Forrest was not originally responsible. He had, indeed, advised letting "the superannuated driveller alone." It is, perhaps, too much to say that Forrest might have prevented the disgraceful tumult. It is not too much to say that he made no attempt to do so. What ensued is well known; there was a riot; the Seventh Regiment fired on the mob, and thirty dead fell in the streets. Mr. Alger leaves the matter with the remark that it reflects "deep and lasting discredit both on the Englishman and the American." He has an evident desire to be just to Macready, but he does not see that, although Macready might probably have checked the insolence of the *Examiner* towards Forrest, and although the discredit of the disgraceful squabbling should be evenly divided, yet the neglect of Forrest to interfere in any way when a riot was impending, and when a few words from him might have saved the blood about to be spilt, lays on the American the burden of a responsibility far greater than the Englishman's.

As we have said before, the effect of this biography will be to raise the general opinion of its subject. More than one anecdote in the book brings into relief the actor's manliness. "An old schoolmate of his, who had become a clergyman, met him one day and asked the favor of a ticket to his performance of 'Lear' that evening, but added that he wished his seat to be in a private box where he could see without being seen. 'No, sir,' was the reply by which the player rebuked the preacher; 'when I look at my audience I should feel ashamed to see there one who is ashamed to be seen. Permit me to say, sir, that our acquaintance ends here.'" When a mere youth he played at Albany second parts to Edmund Kean, for whom he had the highest admiration. "After the play a man whom he had always liked said to him, 'Your *Iago* is better than Kean's *Othello*.' Forrest says, 'I never spoke to that man again.'" Two of the other anecdotes scattered through the volumes deserve quotation. On his first visit to Paris Forrest was invited by a French manager to give an opinion on a new actor. "He will never rise beyond mediocrity," said Forrest; "but that Jewish-looking girl, that little bag of bones with the marble face and the flaming eyes—there is demoniacal power in her. If she lives and does not burn out too soon, she will become something wonderful." That little bag of bones was the then unknown Rachel. Sheridan Knowles had seen Mrs. Siddons act, and Forrest asked him what was the mysterious effect she produced in the sleep-walking scene of *Lady Macbeth*, adding that he had read the usual accounts but wanted the impression she had produced on Knowles, who replied with a sort of shudder, as if the mere remembrance terrified him still, "Well, sir, I smelt blood! I swear I smelt blood!"

The book is well printed, the type is distinct, and the margin ample. Although bound in two volumes it is paged as one. There are fourteen steel plates; nine represent the actor in his leading parts; none rise above mediocrity. The index is insufficient, and the book is but poorly furnished with aids to the reader—running dates, catchwords, etc.—the lavish use of which made the biographies of the late John Forster so easy of reference. The life also lacks, what every theatrical biography should have, a chronological list of all the principal parts played by the actor.

#### MALLERY'S DAKOTA CALENDAR.\*

IT is often a source of surprise that the Indian tribes of our continent have so little historical genius. The great mass of the roaming tribes have had no recorded history; the document before us, if it may be

\* The Life of Edwin Forrest, the American Tragedian. By William Rounseville Alger. "All the world's a stage, and all the men and women merely players." 2 vols. 8vo, pp. 864. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1877. Sold only by subscription. E. R. Felton, Agent, New York.

\* A Calendar of the Dakota Nation. By Bvt. Lieut.-Col. Garrick Mallery, U.S.A. Bulletin of U. S. Geological and Geographical Survey. Washington.



called such, is certainly the first record of the kind published among white men. Consequently even the traditions of the Indians fade out as the generations move on, leaving their far past an impenetrable blank. This is all the more strange, seeing their common use of pictorial representations for wayside war bulletins and for personal biographies. In the first only a few rude figures are scratched on a piece of fresh bark, but they give a complete record of the war party, its numbers, condition, the enemy it has met, its fights and trophies. In the second case the figures are more carefully, sometimes elaborately, painted in all colors, generally on a robe worn by the subject of the eulogy, who thus becomes a walking advertisement of the horses he has given away, the enemies he has killed, and so on.

But Col. Mallery here presents us with something that is a great advance on anything of this sort. In the 'Calendar of the Dakota Nation,' as he calls it, we have the same kind of picture-writing, but now on a different plan. The picture sign—a man with a lame leg, a spotted horse, a row of heads, a buffalo, an arrow in a wound—represents not only the individual event it records, but it becomes the mnemonic sign of a year. Thus the calendar before us consists of seventy-one such figures, representing a series of so many years. They are drawn in black and red in a spiral line, the first of the series at the centre. There is no question of the genuineness of this calendar. It was discovered by Lieut. H. T. Reed, U.S.A., to whom much credit is due. It has since been verified quite extensively, not only by Messrs. Mallery and Reed, but by others. Altogether it is a unique and valuable document. Nevertheless, too much is claimed for it. It is not a national calendar. It really has to do with events specially affecting that part of the Dakota nation now located about Fort Sully and northward. It is not an "official" calendar. There is no proof that it is, and it would be contrary to the usages of the Dakotas. Nor is it any the worse for that: our most trustworthy historians are not officially appointed such. Neither is this calendar the only one. Among tribes of the nation who know nothing of this particular document it has been recognized at once as "a year record"—a calendar. Such things, it seems, have existed among them, even though the whites have been ignorant of it. A credible Indian witness also informs us that he has seen, near Fort Sully, another calendar, which reaches much further back than this.

Col. Mallery's accompanying notes show considerable research and much acuteness, but he is in some points very wide of the mark. For instance, in regard to the meaning of the word "Dakota," he says that the Dakota Indians whom he met always insisted upon the meaning of their national appellation as being simply "men," or "Indian men as distinct from white men." The fact is, they did not know what he was driving at. Again, as to the origin of the Dakota tribes, he speaks quite confidently of "traditions of the Dakotas that they migrated from the Pacific coast." We make bold to say that no reliable traditions to that effect exist. We do know, from their tribal names and from the earlier white records, that for three hundred years their movement has been from the northeast. "Men of the salt water" may refer to those dwelling by any salt lake as well as by the ocean. An important Dakota tribe, the Mdewakantonwan, still bears the name of the cluster of lakes by which they lived in eastern Minnesota two hundred years ago.

Mr. Mallery has unwittingly taken up the too common sentimental twaddle about the rapid decrease of the red man. The Indian seems fated to be misrepresented. He has all kinds of enemies who destroy his character, steal his lands, and forbid him any future. But his fate must now be sealed when even the Geological Survey composes his requiem. Now, as regards the whole Indian population of the country, it is an open question whether they have increased or decreased during the past century. The proofs are accumulating which go to substantiate the former opinion. But as regards this Dakota nation, nothing is surer than that they have been on the steady increase ever since they have been known to white men. The 'Report of the Black Hills Commission of 1876' officially recognizes this fact. True, Mr. Mallery points us to "the Quappas, a mighty horde, which, migrating from west of the Rocky Mountains, led the van of the irruption, and forced its passage through hundreds of miles of hostile territory," and which was "in 1871 reduced to 225 individuals." Now, Lewis and Clark, if we remember right, put down the number of this tribe at that time, which was not long after their first contact with the whites, at about the same figures. Be that as it may, the paragraph is unveracious. Put the word "uninhabited" before "territory," in place of "hostile," and you have the truth of it. Even less than two hundred would be a "horde" mighty enough to force its way through the unoccupied territory which that region was at that time.

The occupation of the Upper Missouri River Valley by any Indians of whom we know anything is a comparatively recent event.

We venture to suggest a few probable mistakes in the interpretation of the calendar signs. Thus: Fig. 17 is given as meaning "Buffalo belly plenty." The sign is evidently a piece of dried or "jerked" buffalo meat. It may be that "belly" is simply interpreter's English for "very." Fig. 51 commemorates the superstitious story that on that year an old woman was found in the belly of a buffalo cow. Col. Mallery attempts to give this a mythical explanation; but do myths ever have such a mushroom growth as this? The Indians do not consider it a myth. In the same connection he speaks of the Dakota "Tongo Wakan," which is rather bad spelling for "Taku Wakan" (Tahkoo Wahkan). Elsewhere he spells the Dakota word for friend "coda" or "cota," instead of "koda," as he should. He quotes authority for saying of the "Tongo Wakan" that they regard him as "the source of all good." This is not strictly correct; for this name, which means The-Something-Mysterious, covers all spiritual unseen powers, bad as well as good. "The gods" would be an approximate translation. Fig. 55: Brave Bear is said to be wearing one of the newly-imported Spanish blankets. In reality, it is something more costly and regal—a robe covered with locks of human hair.

The Hon. Thomas Foster, of Washington, contributes to the volume a letter on the meaning of the tribe-names "Oglala" and "Hunkpapa." It is such a wonderful piece of criticism that it demands particular attention. He dissects the language and reconstructs it to suit any theory, with a facility which is admirable in case one pays no regard to the real laws of the language. Thus, in regard to the interpretation of "Hunkpapa," as "Dried-Beef-Eaters," or "Those-who-make-Dried-Beef," he says "it comes from 'pāpā,' which means dried or parched meat, and the prefix 'un,' which is the sign of causation or use." But he misses the law of this prefix. It refers to the means or instrument, and not to the agent. So that if we follow his etymology the word would mean That-by-which-dried-beef-is-made, which of course it does not mean. Again, he gives us the interpretation of "The Noisy Band," from "un," causation, and "pa" "pa" (both vowels nasal), "to yell." But this, for the same reason given above, could not mean that; but, if "un pa" "pa" means anything, it would be a whistle or trumpet, that by which one calls or yells. Even then the true form would not be this, but "unpanpi." But there are two things that explode Mr. Foster's philology still more thoroughly. First, the radical letter *k*, which is always a strong element and cannot be slipped out by legerdemain. Consequently "unkpāpā," if it refers, according to his first explanation, to "dried meat," would be "our dried meat." But here a second constituent letter steps in, the *k* he cuts off so easily from the beginning of the word. "Hunkpā" is found in "Hunkpatidan," where it stands unquestioned, so that the word is "Hunkpapa." And probably the meaning is "the end men," from "He-inkpā," with reduplication, "inkpapa."

In regard to "Ogalalla" or "Oglala," Mr. Foster is no nearer correct. It is not "glagla," and hence not from "h'dah'da," to ring or rattle, were such a derivation otherwise possible. Its probable derivation is this: If you accept Oglala as the orthography, it comes from "glala," which is equivalent to "hdada" or "kdada," the possessive of "kada," to scatter. If the orthography is Ogallala, it comes directly from "kada," which is in Titon "kala" or "gala," and, with the reduplication for the generic form, "galala." The Dakota story is that, unable to agree in council, the men fell out, and nothing else being ready to hand, one of the vanquished threw a handful of ashes and sand into the face of his opponent.

We have taken up too much space with Mr. Foster's wild guesses, but it is rather important that such rubbish should not pass for scholarship. We advise Col. Mallery to drop that letter.

*The Comedy of the Noctes Ambrosianæ.* By Christopher North. Selected and arranged by John Skelton, Advocate. (New York: Lovell, Adam, Wesson & Co.)—Mr. Skelton has undertaken to give in a single volume, as he tells us in his introduction, that portion of the 'Noctes' which "deals with, or presents directly and dramatically to the reader, human life and character and passion, as distinguished from that portion of it which is critical, and devoted to the discussion of subjects of literary, artistic, or political interest only." The editor has performed his task with judgment and discrimination, and any one who wishes to get an idea of Christopher's North's wit and humor without wading through the voluminous original, can find all that he wants in Mr. Skelton's abridgment. It will, we suppose, always be an increasingly hard piece of work *perere fontes* in this matter. It is surprising in looking over the 'Noctes' in the

cold light of a day in which the wit has ceased to have any contemporary interest to find how little there is in it of permanent value and how much of rubbish. In its own generation the bacchanalian behavior of the characters in the 'Noctes' was made the subject of a good deal of criticism; but the effect of this blench is much heightened by the lapse of time. A reasonable amount of drunkenness in literature has always been considered pardonable, and, if well managed—on the stage or in fiction—amusing; but the most indulgent reader resents a perpetual literary orgy. It is a blow to one's more delicate feelings to find that the humor of a classical work consists in great part of maudlin accusations of drunkenness, preferred against each other by the principal *dramatis personæ*. Such things are no doubt a never-failing source of amusement in all ages and countries among friends who are in the habit of getting drunk together; but as this habit reduces everybody for the time being to the same level, and that not a high one, it requires a good deal of liberality to find what Timothy Tickler would call the "glorious guffawing" of a hundred years old bacchanalian revels still fresh.

Apart from the odor of Glenlivet which pervades the work, the wit is greatly critical, as opposed to dramatic, and critical humor among Scotchmen is apt to be a trifle heavy. No human being can take much interest in discussions about English poetry in which one interlocutor maintains for a page or two that no poet of his age (except possibly Byron) can be said to have written the English language at all, when put in close comparison with Pope, while the other two play the part of interjectional chorus, and the discussion is closed by a vindication of the private character of Lord Byron. Nobody can read this with interest now merely because it was written by John Wilson. As regards the "dramatic" humor, most of it lies in the conception of the character of the *Shepherd*; but with all the deference to traditional opinion on the subject which we find it possible to give, we must say that the *Shepherd's* character is somewhat nebulous. Fine bursts of eloquence or poetry delivered in a broad Scotch accent there no doubt are; but what, beyond descriptive fluency and blunt frankness, are the characteristics of the *Shepherd*? We cannot apply the test of asking whether we can really imagine him walking about like Scott's characters, on two legs, for during much of the time he is not in a condition to walk about at all; but can we say conscientiously that any test shows him to be of real flesh and blood? The *Shepherd* is not consistent even in his adherence to his native dialect, but, when it serves Wilson's purpose, talks as good English as North himself. In the fine description of the "black thunderstorm" (p. 125) what is the reason for making him, contrary to nature, drop his dialect and lapse into English as he grows more interested, unless, indeed, to sacrifice him to the author, and to give more point to his comparison of the style of one of the sentences to that of Burke?

The English have laughed at the Scotch for many a long year for their want of humor. The Scotch have, since the publication of the 'Noctes,' produced this ponderous work in refutation of the charge; but we cannot help fearing that the refutation will, as time goes on, be held to prove instead of to have weakened the strength of the original accusation. The 'Noctes' cannot be said to be any longer light reading. Leave out the conviviality and the personalities, the *tu quoques*, the *tu mentirises*, and the *vos damnemini*, the jokes at the expense of cockneys and liberals (imagine several pages devoted with humor preface to showing that, whereas the death of an ordinary human being in a snowdrift is a painful subject to contemplate, the destruction of two London bagmen in the same way furnishes amusing food for thought), and very little is left. The *Shepherd* presents now almost the only claim of the work to immortality—a claim that time alone and the endurance of the public can prove to be well or ill founded.

*Properties and Powers in Every-day Matters*; illustrated for children. By A. Corey. (Newark, N. J.: Martin R. Dennis & Co.)—The especial

difficulty in preparing a book for children consists in arrangement. Adult readers can sometimes catch abstract thoughts even when poorly stated, but to children such thoughts will seem like Greek quotations, unless they are led gradually to them with masterful tact. Arrangement has three sub-divisions, namely, of topics, of sentences, and of words. It is in respect to the second division, the arrangement of sentences among themselves, that we condemn this book as a failure. The order of topics is simple enough, but in treating of each one the author cannot tell middle from end, and writes sentence after sentence somewhat as one might do if required at a university examination to state all that he knew in five minutes. Persons versed in science do not realize that they are to persons unversed as birds to animals, when it regards passing from one level of thought to another. When they expect little boys to accompany them, they forget that little boys have to ascend from the foundation, and that the omission of one step, not to say ten, creates a hopeless chasm. In the second chapter, entitled "Properties of Matter," more than one-half of the words are unintelligible to children, because the author proceeds from abstractions to individuals, instead of proceeding from individual instances up to abstract ideas. The chapters which follow contain much useful information correctly stated, though not always derived from the latest authorities. But the last quarter of the book is composed of culinary recipes, which are as incongruous with what precedes as is the conclusion of an old-fashioned sermon on "the doctrine of election, followed by some remarks on baptism."

*A Manual of English History*; for the use of schools. By Edward M. Lancaster, Principal of the Stoughton School, Boston, Mass. (New York: A. S. Barnes & Co. 1877. 12mo, pp. 220.)—With so many good histories of England to choose from, we cannot see that Mr. Lancaster's presents any special claim to attention. The main facts are, of course, correct, and are selected with good judgment, the style is generally good, and the book appears to be well adapted for the use of a school-room; but there are numberless points of detail, most of them trifling in themselves, which betray a lack of a thorough and fundamental acquaintance with the scholarship of the subject. For example, the account given of the origin of trial by jury (p. 51) is wholly incorrect; besides that, it takes notice only of the jury for criminal cases, not of the civil jury, which at this period is far more important. In the account of the Babington plot (p. 162) Queen Mary is stated positively to have been implicated; but the latest investigations have made it almost certain that she was the victim of a conspiracy. Her complicity in the murder of Darnley (p. 161) we suppose to be far better established. The apparatus of the book is very good. A useful feature (pp. vi. and vii.) is "Names of Kings and Leading Topics," giving the chief events of each reign in a few words. Here the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts (which was in 1828) is assigned to Queen Victoria. Then follows a good genealogical table, in which, however, the third son of Richard, Duke of York, is called Earl of Warwick, instead of Duke of Clarence. A sketch of the extent of the British Empire (p. x.) and of the present Constitution (p. 300) are very good. So are the two Indexes at the end of the book and the map at the beginning. There ought, however, to be at least one historical map of England before the Norman Conquest.

\* Publishers will confer a favor by always marking the price of their books on the wrapper.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Price.
BOOKS OF THE WEEK.	
Allen (J. H.) and Greenough (J. B.), Latin Grammar, revised ed. .... (Ginn & Heath)	
Harte (B.), Fünf neue Erzählungen, swd. .... (A. B. Auerbach)	
Johnson (Rev. S.), Oriental Religions: China. .... (J. R. Osgood & Co.)	
Laurie (Rev. T.), Glimpses of Christ in Holy Scripture. .... (Cong. Pub. Society)	
Littre (E.), Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Langue Française, Parts I-III, swd. .... (F. W. Christern)	
Sozinsky (Dr. T. S.), The Culture of Beauty. .... (Allen, Lane & Scott)	
Student Life at Harvard, swd. .... (Lockwood, Brooks & Co.)	\$1 00
Theuriet (A.), Gerard's Marriage: a Tale. .... (D. Appleton & Co.)	
Woman and her Saviour in Persia. .... (Cong. Pub. Society)	

## Bain's Course in Grammar.

A BRIEF LOGICAL GRAMMAR. 45 cts.  
KEY TO THE ABOVE. 45 cts.  
A HIGHER GRAMMAR. 80 cts.  
GRAMMAR AS BEARING UPON COM-  
position. \$1 40.

Full Descriptive Catalogue sent upon application.

HENRY HOLT & CO., NEW YORK.

Continued from page iii.

MASSACHUSETTS, Boston, 120 Charles Street.  
**MRS. and MISS SOUTHWATE'S Family**  
and Day School for Girls and Young Ladies.

MASSACHUSETTS, Boston, 34 Newbury Street.  
**NEWBURY STREET SCHOOL for Young**  
Ladies.—A few home pupils under the care of Miss Lucretia  
P. Hale. For full information address Rev. HENRY C. BADGER.

MASSACHUSETTS, Boston, 5 Otis Place, Brimmer Street.  
**OTIS PLACE SCHOOL.—A thorough and**  
efficient school for girls of all ages above the Kindergarten.  
French or German lessons daily. Address the Principal, Mrs. A.  
C. MARTIN.

MASSACHUSETTS, Boston, 10 Somerset Street.  
**PRIVATE SCHOOL FOR BOYS.** Estab-  
lished 1860.

The eighteenth year of this school will begin on Monday, Septem-  
ber 17, 1877, and end on June 30, 1878.

The course of study has in view the preparation of boys for Har-  
vard University and the Scientific Schools, and the thoroughness of  
this preparation may be inferred from the fact that no pupil of the  
sixteen classes sent from this school to Harvard has failed to pass the  
examinations.

Copies of the circular, explaining the methods of instruction and  
of discipline adopted in the school, and also copies of recent exami-  
nation-papers, will be sent to any address on application to  
W. N. EAYRS.

MASSACHUSETTS, College Hill (four miles from Boston).  
**TUFTS COLLEGE.** E. H. Capen, President.  
For catalogues address Prof. C. E. FAY, Sec.



